ELON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
ELON UNIVERSITY
NUMEN LUMEN
18 89
NORTH CAROLINA
Elon, North Carolina
230.5833
L854tr

NOV - - 2006

MCS coll 1997 3.9

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/atreatiseonchris00long

A Treatise on Christian Theology, Embracing Biblical, Historical, and Systematic

By: Reverend William Samuel Long

Published by: Southern Christian Publishing Company
Elon College, NC

1913

A Treatise on Christian

~~CHRISTIAN~~ THEOLOGY

Embracing

~~BRIEFLY OUTLINES~~

Biblical, Historical, and Systematic

by

REV. W. S. LONG, D. D., A.M. LL.D

With Introduction

by

REV. N. C. WICKER, D. D.,

Published

By

~~SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,~~

~~WAKE COLLEGE, N. C.~~

PREFACE.

~~About three years ago it was suggested to me by Rev. J. O. Atkinson, Rev. J. W. Wellons, and others that I~~ I purpose to write a hand-book of Systematic Theology adapted to the needs of ~~our~~ young men preparing themselves for the ministry. For years I had hoped to see such a work because I have seen some promising young men go out with unsettled views of Christian doctrine, who soon become victims to some form of fanaticism ~~and their~~ whose usefulness was thereby impaired or destroyed. I have enjoyed an extensive acquaintance with the most prominent ministers and laymen of the Christian Church in the South and in other parts of the United States and Canada, extending back to the contemporaries of Rev. James O'Kelly, and I believe I have, in this ~~little~~ volume, stated substantially the doctrinal views held and taught by the church from its organization. I am free to admit that some have been in the church who have held other views on minor points of doctrine, and there may be others now among us who are not in full accord with all this volume teaches, but at the same time I confidently assert that the views herein given have been believed and taught by the leading ministers of the Christian Church. Entire agreement on all points of Scripture doctrine has never been attained by any organization of Christians, and doubtless never will be on account of limitations on the human understanding.

The ground of emphasis has been shifted in theology from what it was when the creeds of the sixteenth century were written, and the most of these creeds have outlived their usefulness and efficiency. Not necessarily because they are erroneous, but rather because they are totally inadequate to meet the demands of Christian faith in this age. ~~In the judgment of many, the sooner the most of them are retired as obsolete the better it will be for the cause of Christianity.~~

They alone can command the attention and confidence of thinking and intelligent men, ~~in this age~~ who have a theology that can be preached, a theology that is at once reasonable and Scriptural. To him who recognizes man's true free moral agency, and who believes in the universal Fatherhood of

a loving God, and in a Christ for the world and the world for Christ -- to him alone, by moral right, belongs the privilege of occupying the foremost place in the moral conquest of the world. To him who believes that God's love and Christ's atonement are not only as wide as the human race and as deep as sin, but as high as heaven -- to him and to him alone, belongs the right to preach, in the full assurance of Christian hope, a salvation from all sin and all unholiness of life and conduct. That theory of the spiritual life which gives proper emphasis to each one of this sacred quaternion of Scripture doctrines -- the moral free agency of man, the unlimited love of God as manifested in the atonement of Jesus Christ, the power and pledge of the Holy Spirit to save from all sin, and the possibility through grace of living a godly life -- that theory, however defective in minor details, cannot, we believe, be very far removed from the true theory of the Christian life.

In conclusion I remark that I have used the commonly accepted version of the Scriptures. ~~(No other has yet received general recognition.~~ It will also be observed that I have never applied the term "saint" to any Apostle or sacred writer, because it is a relict of Romanism and, in our opinion, should not be used by Protestants.

May God's blessing follow this humble effort to promote His glory.

William Samuel Long.

Chapel Hill, N. C.

April 19, 1913.

Chapter I

Definition of Terms. PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

Theology is that science which treats of the being and attributes of God, his relations to us, the dispensations of His providence, His will with respect to our future. The word was first used to denote the systems of those poets and philosophers who wrote of the genealogy and exploits of the gods of Greece. Hence Orpheus, ~~Museus~~ Museus, Hesiod, Plato, etc., were called theologians. The term was afterward adopted by the earliest writers of the Christian Church, who styled the apostle John, the author of the Apocalypse, by way of eminence, the theologian. The word is from Theos -- God, and logos -- a discourse. It was adopted by the Christian Fathers, and applied to biblical truth. The word is variously defined as "The science of religion;" "The science of God;" "The science of the supernatural."

The word religion is, however, ambiguous. Its etymology is doubtful. Cicero refers it to relegere -- to go over again, to reconsider. "Religio" is then consideration, devout observance, especially of what pertains to the worship and service of God. Others derive it from religare -- to bind fast. Subjectively, it expresses a state of mind. Stated most simply, it is that state of mind induced by sincere repentance towards God and faith in Jesus Christ, and a due sense of our relation to God.

What is religion as revealed in the Sacred Scriptures, or, as it is sometimes called Supernatural Religion? "Religion is the life of man in personal communication with God," (Christian Dogmatics). "An acknowledgment of our duties towards the law of God, the recognition of all our duties as if they were Divine commands," (Kant). Religion has its seat in the heart; its presence there is exhibited in a godlike life. It is the life of God in the soul of manifesting itself daily in practical morality; separation between personal religion and practical morality is impossible.

The term Religion is, however, often used to describe the truths which it teaches, as well as the conduct which it requires. [illegible]

Christians, Christianity -- meaning thereby the truths and doctrines of Christianity -- and religion were identical. The apologies of Justin, Tertullian, and others, were directed to prove that Christianity, as taught in the Sacred Scriptures, was the only religion that could satisfy man's spiritual wants.

The revelation of God to man is twofold, Natural and Supernatural. The great book of nature has always been open to the study of man, and from it he has been able to learn the existence of a Supreme Being, upon whom he is dependent, and to whom he owes obedience and worship, Rom. 1:19-21; Acts 14:17; Acts 17:23-29; Psalms 19:1-6. This is called natural religion. Christianity is one of many religions; but of all these it is the one most worthy of God, if, indeed, it is not the only one worthy of Him.

The mental faculty which lies at the root of religion appears to be universal; for in some way man universally recognizes some object of belief and worship, and a definite course of life and conduct, as a result of that belief. Plutarch says: "A city without a temple, without worship, without prayers, no one ever saw." Cicero says: "There never was any nation so barbarous, nor any people so savage, as to be without some notion of gods." This is a law of nature.

Religion is experimental and has reference to the heart and life; Theology is scientific. A theologian may be acquainted intellectually with systematic religious knowledge without possessing religion. A religious man is a theologian so far as his knowledge of God, His nature, His will, and His word are correct.

Natural Theology treats of the Deity, attributes, and providence of God, as these are revealed by nature. "It is the knowledge of God from His works by the light of nature."

The question whether the knowledge of God derived from His works, be sufficient to lead fallen man to salvation, is answered affirmatively by Rationalists, but negatively by every historical branch of the Christian

On this point the Greek, the Latin, the Lutheran, and some others are agreed. The two former are more exclusive than the others. The Greek and Latin, in making the sacraments the only channels of saving grace, deny the possibility of the salvation of the unbaptized, whether in heathen or Christian lands. This principle is so essential to the Romish system as to be included in the very definition of the Church, as given by the authoritative writers of the a Papal Church. That definition is so framed as to exclude from the hope of salvation not only all unbaptized infants and adults, but all, no matter however enlightened in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and however holy in heart and life, who do not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope of Rome.

The question as to the sufficiency of natural theology, or of the truths of reason, is to be answered on the authority of the Scriptures. No man can tell a priori what is necessary to salvation. Indeed, it is only by supernatural revelation that we know that any sinner can be saved. It is from the same source alone we can know what are the conditions of salvation, or who are to be its subjects. Christian Theology.

Christian Theology -- or Theology proper, -- deals with: (1) The evidences which prove the Sacred Scriptures to be a divinely-inspired revelation to man; (2) The proper interpretation of these Scriptures; (3) The discoveries which they make to us of God, His nature, attributes, relations to, and dealings with, man; (4) Of man, his relations and duties to God and to his fellow-men; (5) Of the future life, with its rewards and punishments.

THE SOURCES OF THIS THEOLOGY.

1. Reason, the faculty of ideas, not separate from, but most closely united with, the heart and conscience, -- this is an original faculty given by God to individual man, and no supra-natural revelation can be given which is not addressed to him: (a) As a rational being, and through the channel of his reason; and (b) As consistent with the unbiased deductions of reason, acting legitimately within its own sphere.

2. But reason has, by all experience, been proven to be insufficient to guide man as to his life and conduct; God has, therefore, put into our

hands a supernatural and sufficient revelation of Himself, and the relations which He bears to us, and we to Him. It follows, therefore, that the ground and source of our theological knowledge is His inspired word, as revealed to us in the Sacred Scriptures.

3. Nevertheless, as this revelation is addressed to our understanding (including heart and conscience), its evidences are to be judged and authenticated by our intellectual faculties, and the record itself interpreted by our reason, according to its own laws.

Is there not a danger of reason diverging into Rationalism? Most certainly there is; and this is one of the great perils of the present day, and of modern criticism. By reason is meant that faculty of the human mind by which man arrives at truth without any supersensuous aid: this implies his understanding, conscience, and experience, all acting under natural circumstances.

The use of this faculty of reason in matters of religion is: (1) To examine and decide upon the evidences of Divine revelation; (2) To ascertain - by the application of the established laws of interpretation to the sacred writings -- what are the truths therein revealed; (3) Having determined that certain truths and doctrines are revealed, to accept them upon the authority of God, even though they may be mysterious, or may appear not to be in accord with human wisdom. The question in regard to any fact (or doctrine) is not, is it reasonable? but first of all, is it clearly established by the word of God? That being so, the province of reason ceases, and faith comes in; reason cannot pronounce upon the reasonableness or unreasonableness of any statement of Divine revelation which reason itself has decided to be "clearly revealed" in Scripture. "Finite reason must submit itself to infinite; the never-fully educated human understanding, limited by time, matter, and individuality, must yield to the perfect truth which comes from God; a judgment which is subject to vacillations and disturbances to one that is ever settled and abiding - 'the same yesterday, today and forever.'" -- Watson.

RATIONALISM.

1. Rationalism strictly so called is the dogma which insists that there is no higher source of knowledge than reason. It involves the denial of Divine revelation in the proper sense of the word, and, of course, rejects miracles and prophecy. Hence, inspiration is either denied, or regarded as "the enthusiasm of genius;" the Scriptures are reduced to the level of other writings of genius; what in them appears to be miraculous, or supernatural, is interpreted as the result of natural laws.

2. In a wider sense Rationalism embraces the various forms of scepticism and unbelief which are held by those who deny supernatural knowledge.

The Principal Forms which Rationalism has Taken: Pantheism, Gnosticism, Positivism, Secularism, Materialism, Deism, Atheism.

1. Pantheism, (from Pas πᾶς, all, and theos θεὸς, God,) is "the doctrine that God includes all reality, and is identical with it, nothing besides Him really existing. He is the One and the All." "Besides God no substance can exist or be conceived to exist." "All is God," or "God is all." "The Universe is God," or "God is the Universe." The God of Pantheism is not a Being -- who can will, and think, and love, -- but an essence pervading and permeating all things; which can be no object of trust, or love, or worship. It is a kind of Atheism, which makes God and the universe identical, and consequently, denies the existence of a personal God, and His superintendence and sovereignty over the universe. Spinoza. Herbert Spencer.

2. Positivism teaches: (1) That all our knowledge is confined to physical phenomena; (2) That we can only know that such phenomena are are, and the relations which we stand to them, which relations are all included under the head of sequence and resemblance. "The senses are the true source of all thinking, and we can know nothing except the phenomena which they apprehend, and the relation and sequence in which these phenomena stand to each other. Mental phenomena can all be resolved into immaterial phenomena, and there is no such thing discoverable as either an origin or purpose in

the world, as consequently, either a creative or providential intelligence." "Private adoration is to be addressed to collective humanity in the persons of worthy individual representatives, who may be either living or dead, but must in all cases be women; for women being sexe aimant, represent the best attribute of humanity, that which ought to regulate all human life; nor can Humanity be symbolised in any form but that of a woman." "Examination of J. S. Mill's Philosophy," by James McCosh, LL. D. See also "Positive Philosophy," by Comte.

(αγνωστος)

3. Agnosticism, Agnostos, "unknown" the inscription upon the altar at Athens, referred to by Paul, Acts 17:23. In plain English it means "ignorance." An Agnostic is avowedly a "know-nothing" in religion. He holds that the existence of anything beyond and behind phenomena is unknown, and (so far as can be judged) unknowable; and especially that a First Cause and an unseen world are subjects of which we know, and can know, nothing. The term was first applied by Prof. Huxley to himself and others, who, while not denying the existence of an Intelligent First Cause and a supernatural revelation, yet insist that we do not know anything about those and cognate subjects, and that we have no means of knowing; both because we have no faculties capable of understanding such things, and that there are no methods by which they could be communicated to us. "The Agnostic neither denies nor affirms God. He simply puts him on one side." Huxley's "Science and Culture."

4. Secularism does not say with the Agnostic that God, an unseen world, and a future state cannot be known; but that so little can be known about them that it is our wisdom to give attention chiefly to the present life. "Putting the two worlds into two scales of value, the Secularist finds (or thinks he finds) that the one weighs much, the other either nothing, or nothing that can be appreciated." "The old policy of sacrificing the welfare of humanity on earth to the merely possible and altogether unknown requirements beyond the grave" the Secularist regards as absurd. Secularism

is so protean that it is impossible in brief space to give an exact definition of its teaching or creed. It may be best described as ancient Epicureanism under a new name and garb. I. Cor. 15:32.

5. Materialism recognizes nothing but matter, and denies the existence of Spirit or of a spiritual world. The soul is but the result of a peculiar organization of matter; the operations of mind are merely the effect of material forces; there is no existence beyond the grave, and, therefore, no moral accountability. Matter and force are the only entities, and these are sufficient to solve all the problems of the universe. "The fundamental affirmation of Materialism is, that all the phenomena of the Universe--physical, vital, and mental -- are to be referred to unintelligent physical forces; and its fundamental negation is, that there is no such objective entity of mind or spirit." -- Hodge.

6. Deism is a belief in the existence of a personal God, but denial of the necessity and fact of Divine revelation, together with the assertion that the light of nature and reason are sufficient guides for man's belief and practice. Of course, in such a theory Christianity is ignored. (Leslie's Short and Easy Method with Deists.) Deist and Theist have etymologically the same meaning -- the former from the Latin, the latter from the Greek, -- but they differ widely in their use. Theist is applied to any believer in God, whether he be a Christian, a Jew, or a Mohammedan; while a Deist is one who believes in God, but disbelieves in Christianity, or, more accurately, who disbelieves in any supernatural revelation.

7. Atheism -- without God. The absolute denial of a God, or any intelligent First Cause, or of a superintending providence. Whatever difficulty there may be in demonstrating the existence of God, it is not conceivable that proof can be found to justify the declaration "There is no God." Unless a man knows all things, he cannot know that the Being whose existence he rejects does not exist. Absurd and irrational as atheism is, it has had its votaries and martyrs. In the seventeenth century, Spinoza, a Dutchman,

was its noted defender. It has been questioned, however, whether any man ever seriously adopted such a principle. The protestations to it have been generally founded on pride or affectation.

Speculative atheism is unreasonable upon five accounts. (1) Because it gives no tolerable account of the existence of the world. (2) It does not give any reasonable account of the universal consent of mankind in this apprehension, that there is a God. (3) It requires more evidence for things than they are capable of giving. (4) The atheist pretends to know that which no man can know. (5) Atheism contradicts itself.

"The Materialist is necessarily an Atheist, though he will probably not admit it. The Secularist may be a Theist, but many avow themselves Atheists. The Agnostic, and the Positivist -- who is, in fact, simply a systematic Agnostic -- are not theoretic like Atheists, yet their teachings lead almost directly to that end."--Bradlaugh.

In What Sense can Theology be Called a Science?

Science means knowledge systematized. By science here is meant "accurate, well-founded, and well-ordered knowledge, in whatever manner that knowledge is acquired." The knowledge gained by faith has a right to be considered scientific, if it be well founded and systematized. As truth as that which comes from observation and reasoning, so does astronomy and mathematics. Its subject matter cannot be mathematically demonstrated, but in its own domain its truths are capable of moral demonstrations: certitude is reached by a different process, but one which -- in its own sphere -- is quite as satisfactory as that of mathematics. It is a science of faith, not of credulity; its evidences are moral, probable, ontological, demonstrative; its arguments are analogical and inferential; but it is the great business of life to draw inferences, and an inference, whether in Science or Religion, is an exercise of faith, and can be nothing else. It is a great mistake to speak of Science as inductive and Theology as deductive. No science is verified till we can reason ~~deducting~~ from an inductive discovery. We have no

right to call it a law till we can rigorously apply it, and account for its apparent exceptions. In the same way Theology is only the deductive application of certain inductive discoveries in the open page of God's Word.

The Bible is no more a system of theology, than nature is a system of chemistry or of mathematics. We find in nature the facts which the chemist or the mathematical philosopher has to examine, and from them to ascertain the laws by which they are determined. So the Bible contains the truths which the theologian has to collect, authenticate, arrange, and exhibit in their internal relation to each other. This constitutes the difference between biblical and systematic theology. The office of the former is to ascertain and state the facts of scripture. The office of the latter is to state those facts, determine their relation to each other, and to other cognate truths, as well as to vindicate them and show their harmony and consistency. This is not any easy task, or one of slight importance.

It may be asked, why not take the truths as God has seen fit to reveal them, and thus save ourselves the trouble of showing their relation and harmony? The answer is that it cannot be done. Such is the constitution of the human mind that it cannot help endeavoring to systematize and reconcile the facts which it admits to be true. In no department of knowledge have men been satisfied with the possession of a mass of undigested facts. And the students of the Bible can as little be expected to be thus satisfied. There is a necessit , therefore, for the construction of systems of theology. Of this the history of the Church affords abundant proof. In all ages and among all denominations, such systems have been produced. Besides this, a much higher kind of knowledge is thus obtained, than by the mere accumulation of isolated facts.

If we would discharge our duty as teachers and defenders of the truth, we must endeavor to bring all the facts of revelation into systematic order and mutual relation. It is only thus that we can satisfactorily exhibit their truth, vindicate them from objections, or bring them to bear in

their full force on the minds of men. God is evidently the [illegible]. He does not teach men astronomy or chemistry, but He gives them the whole out of which these sciences are constructed. Neither does He teach us systematic theology, but He gives us in the Bible the truths, which, properly understood and arranged, constitute the science of theology. As the facts of nature are all related and determined by physical laws, so the facts of the Bible are all related and determined by the nature of God and His creatures. And as He wills that men should study His works and discover their wonderful organic relation and harmonious combination, so it is His will that we should study His Word, and learn that, like the stars, its truths are not isolated points, but systems, cycles, and epicycles in unending harmony and grandeur. Besides all this, although the Scriptures do not contain a system of theology as a whole, we have in the Epistles of the New Testament, portions of that system wrought out to our hands. These are our authority and guide.

WHAT IS DOGMA?

1. The term Dogma is from the Greek dokeo, to think; it is used ~~used~~ to denote the form in which truth is presented or apprehended. It is synonymous with formula, canon, tenet, opinion. It is commonly used to signify an arbitrary article of Faith; but that is neither its original, nor its correct meaning.

2. In its ancient use it had two distinct meanings: one in the Old Testament translated by the LXX, and in the New Testament; the other in philosophical writings. In the former it meant a decree, or ordinance, i.e., a command as to conduct or observance, either of human or Divine authority, as in Dan. 2:13-15; Dan. 6:9; Luke 2:1; Acts 17:7; Acts 16:4; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14. In the latter meaning, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, and others used the word to describe the doctrines and the rules formulated and taught by different schools of philosophy. In this latter sense the word came to be used by the early Christian writers, as describing [illegible], or heretical teaching, as the case might be.

5. Dogma is not a term peculiar to Theology or religion. All sciences -- physical, mathematical, logical -- have their [illegible], [illegible] of these arise from axioms, others from the results of observation and experiment. The rules and formulas of Mathematics, Chemistry, [illegible], are so many dogmas or canons, which have, at least in the beginning, to be accepted upon authority.

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

This designation was first given to Theology by a German divine in 1724. It is that branch of theology which systematizes the dogmas or doctrines of Divine revelation, which sets them forth in the form of a connected doctrinal system. Doctrine and Dogma are in most instances convertible, or interchangeable terms. Dogmatic Theology includes: (1) Biblical Theology, which embraces textual criticism, exegesis or hermeneutics, archaeology, scriptural geography, history, etc.

(2) Historical Theology, comprising ecclesiastical history, the progress and development of doctrines, and all that belongs to the external as well as the internal life of the Church.

(3) Systematic Theology, which comprehends all the foregoing; it takes the system of doctrines as its basis, verifies it by scripture, and illustrates it from history.

IN WHAT FORM HAS DOGMATIC THEOLOGY BEEN [illegible]

Chiefly by Ancient Creeds and Confessions: e.g., 1. The Apostle's Creed (so called). The Nicean, A. D. 325. The Athanasian, circa A. D. [illegible]. 2. The Confessions, or formularies of various Churches, viz., (a) The Lutheran, in the Augsburg Confession, A. D. 1530; (b) The Reformed or Calvinistic, in the Helvetic Confession, A. D. 15[illegible]; (c) The [illegible], in the Westminster Confession and Catechism, A. D. 16[illegible]; (d) The Anglican, in the Thirty-nine Articles; (e) The Arminian, in the Remonstrant's Confession, A. D. 1620; (f) The Wesleyan (English) in Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament," and certain of his sermons; (American) Wesley's [illegible] of the Thirty-nine Articles. 3. The creeds and Councils of the [illegible] churches.

CHAPTER II.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

God, the self-existent, infinitely perfect, and infinitely [illegible] Being, who created and preserves all things that have existence. As the Divine Being possesses a nature far beyond the comprehension of any of His creatures, of course, that nature is inexplicable. All our knowledge of invisible objects is obtained by analogy; that is, by the resemblance which they bear to visible objects; but as there is in nature no exact resemblance of the nature of God, an attempt to explain the divine nature is absurd and impracticable. All similitudes, therefore, which are used in attempting to explain it, must be rejected. Yet, though we cannot fully understand His nature, there is something of Him we may know. He has been pleased to discover His perfections, in a measure, by the works of creation and the Scriptures of truth; these, therefore, we ought to study, in order that we may obtain the most becoming thoughts of Him.

I. <u>What is the Relation of the Existence of God to Theology?</u> The first and greatest question in Religion and Theology is: Have we sufficient grounds for believing in the existence of an Intelligent First Cause? Belief in God is the foundation of all religion. If we have not sufficient reason for this belief, then such questions as, "Is revelation credible?" "Are miracles possible?" "Is prayer reasonable?" -- everything, in fact, relating to man, the laws to which he may be subject, the authority of the Scriptures, his life here or hereafter -- may be dismissed as of little or no consequence. If we have not sufficient evidence of the existence of God, moral accountability has no existence, personal immortality is a myth, and all that is included in the idea of religion is utterly destroyed.

Two theories are before the world: the one <u>Materialistic</u>, the other <u>Theistic</u>. According to the former "the original, fundamental constitutive power in the universe is blind force," or "energy." [illegible]

the latter "it is a living, intelligent, personal god." Neither of these theories can be mathematically demonstrated. All that can be done in either case is to deduce from the examination of nature the existence of some power outside and beyond nature, as necessary to explain its various facts and phenomena. Which of these theories is the more reasonable? Which best explains the mysteries of the universe, of both matter and mind? Which is supported by the best and most convincing evidence? Which has the highest claims to be accepted?

This is the problem to be considered in this chapter; and though it is not possible to afford a complete solution, yet, so far as our limits permit, we hope to show that Theism offers the only, and the sufficient, explation of the "Power," or "Force," or "energy," or "a double-faced something" which Materialists, Agnostics, and Pantheists all recognise in the universe.

II. How Can we Define the Term "God?"

As that infinitely great, intelligent, holy Being, of perfect wisdom, power, and goodness, transcendently glorious, the Creator of the universe, who preserves it by His providence, and governs it according to His laws. The name is derived from the Icelandic Godi, the Supreme Magistrate, which perfectly agrees with the scriptural name Jehovah, as the moral governor of the Universe. Dr. A. Clark derives the word from the Anglo-Saxon, as synonymous with good. Some trace the word to the Hebrew ochel-unus — "The One Being."

III. By What Names is God Revealed to us in the Sacred Scriptures?

1. Elohim אלהים "adorable," "strong." This word is usually plural, or used with plural adjuncts. The Christian Fathers held this to indicate a plurality of persons in the Deity, -- a belief which appears to be well founded, and which is still held. (See Watson's and Farrar's Biblical Dictionaries).

2. Jehovah (~~Yahwey or Jehovah~~) יהוה translated "Lord," - "Self-Ex-

Yahweh

istent," "The Being," "I am," "I am that I am," Exod. 3:14. This name is never used except when applied to the Divine Being.

5. El-Shaddai or Shaddai — "The Strong;" "The Mighty One;" "Almighty," "All-Sufficient."

4. Adonai — "Lord," "Supporter," "Judge," "Master."

5. El-Elyon — "The Most High," "The Supreme."

6. Elyeh — "I am," "I Will Be."

The first sentence of the Bible unfolds the doctrine that there is a God, the Creator of all things, Gen. 1:1, and the belief of this doctrine is the first and fundamental principle of all true religion, hence it demands primary and serious consideration. Heb. 11:6. The inspired writers assume this doctrine as a truth known and admitted, so they do not enter into any formal proof of it.

The existence of God is proven by our own existence, and the existence of what is seen around us, as well as from what the Scriptures declare. All things which are seen began to exist. For they either created themselves, came into existence by mere chance, or were created by some other being.

But self-creation is a contradiction, for it supposes that a being can act before it exists, or that an effect is the cause of itself. Hence to write matter with a capital M and call it God relieves no difficulty, while it raises many. Creation by chance is absurd; for to say that a thing is produced, and yet there is no cause of its production, is to say that something is effected when it is effected by nothing; that is not effected at all.

All things, then, which do appear, must have been created by some other Being -- that Being is God. Gen. 2:1; Acts 14:15; 17:24; Heb. 3:4, and 11:3. The design, also, discoverable in the constitution, harmony, and government of the visible universe, proves the being of God. The marks of design are too obvious to be denied. Design implies a designer, and the designer must exist prior to the things designed. This designer is called God

If the modern theory of the evolution of men and animals from some germ were true, there must be a Creator of this germ. Evolution implies an Evolver. This must be God. Hence, the works of creation prove the existence of God. Psa. 19:1; 95:3-5; 100:3; Isa. 40:12; Zech. 12:1; Acts 17:24; Rom. 1:20.

The existence of life on the earth is proof of an intelligent Creator. Geology carries us back to a period when this earth, just cooled from its condition of a molten mass, had not the first trace of life. No such trace can be found in the oldest or fire-made rocks. But in the water-deposited rocks just above them, the first traces of organic life is found. The gulf between dead matter and organic life is infinitely broad. It can be bridged, not by any natural law, but by the intervention of an act of omnipotent power in creation only. In geologic epochs there are several such points where old races are destroyed and new ones introduced so different from the former that they could not be derived from them, and hence they must have been direct creations. This doctrine has further evidence of its truth in what are called the events of Providence. Exod. 5:1; 7:12; 8:16-22; 14:3-29, and 18:10.

PERSONALITY AS APPLIED TO GOD.

It means that He is a living Being, possessing and exercising the functions of a rational and intelligent nature. He is some-one, not something, -- a self-conscious some-one, who can exercise volition, intelligence, approval or disapproval; in other words, a Being who possesses natural and mental attributes.

The personality of God does not involve limitation ; it is the same as personality in man, only that, instead of being finite, it is infinite. "Perfect personality is to be found only in God, while in all finite spirits there exists only a weak imitation of personality." (Young's "Analytical Concordance.") Herbert Spencer, the Positivists, and Agnostics, argue that personality ~~is made the standard of comparison, whereas, human personality is~~

and absolute existence are contradictions; that, if God be a person, He cannot be Infinite. The mistake here is, that human personality is made the standard of comparison, whereas human personality is only a limited copy of the real — the unlimited — personality of God. Man is made in the image of God; not God the extended image of man. God is a person; the chief attribute of God is freedom. He is the self-determined One, His determination is the perfect manifestation of Himself; this is the significance of the Will of God; the holiness of God is the central principle in that Will, the principle in which cannot become other than Himself; the righteousness of God is the expression of a person towards those who are persons. We know God as a person, but we realize that our conception of personality does not adequately represent the whole being of God. Even when aided by the revelation that God gives of Himself in His word, our conception can only be partial, though accurate.

The universe is a <u>thought</u> as well as a thing. As fraught with design it reveals thought as well as force. The thought includes the origination of the forces and their law, as well as the combination and use of them. These thoughts must include the whole universe. It follows, then, that the universe is controlled by a single thought, or the <u>think</u> of a single thinker. A thinker is a person. Daniel Webster said, "The greatest thought that ever entered my mind was my personal responsibility to a personal God." Descartes said, "I think, therefore I am a person. And I must have been brought into existence by a being at least as perfect as I am, for the [illegible] higher than its source."

<u>WHAT ARE THE SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD?</u>

1. <u>Intuition</u>, sometimes called the <u>Historical Argument</u>, or <u>Consensus Genitum</u>.

The idea of a Being above and superior to man, and by whom all things exist, is born with him. So far as is known, there is not, and never has been, any tribe or people who have not had some conception of God, however visionary or imperfect. The concept of God is the revelation of Himself to the human soul. Man has by nature an original [illegible]

presence, which precedes all observation and reasoning. The belief in God is an instinct. There is a knowledge of God which all men have. But our intuition or intuitive knowledge of God cannot be defined.

"The intuition which demands a cause however effect is satisfied when it reaches a Being with power adequate to the whole effect; and if on the contemplation of the nature of that Being we find no mark of it being an effect, the intuition makes no call for us to go further."- McCosh. There are certain truths which the mind perceives to be true, without proof or testimony. Such are the axioms of Geometry, and such is the principle that every effect must have its cause. This conviction is said to be an inate truth, because such is the nature of the mind that it cannot but see such things to be true.

2. <u>The Evidence of Design, or the Teleological Argument.</u> —

Everywhere throughout the visible universe there are evidences of adaptation of means to ends -- purpose -- and this necessarily implies personality and intelligence. Paley illustrates this by a man finding a watch, and upon examination of its mechanism he comes to the conclusion "that the watch must have had a maker; that there must have existed, at some time and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose which he found it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction and designed its use." Contrivance proves personality. The evidence of contrivance or design in the world proves that its originator must possess personality: while the whole structure of the universe proves Him to be a "Being infinite, as well in essence as in power; yet nevertheless a person." Cicero argues "that it would be more reasonable to believe that the letters of the alphabet thrown together would fall into such order as legibly to form the Annals of Ennis than that the world was made by a fortuitous concourse of atoms which have no form, no colour, no sense." In the last century (and previously) one of the principal arguments used to prove the existence of God was that known as <u>à priori</u>, i. e., from the nature

of a cause to the nature of its effects; we lay down certain principles or axioms, and from these deduce other truths that are more complex; and as the principles from which we begin are first known to us, and in the order of our thoughts are prior to the truths deduced from them, we are said to argue a priori. Descartes, Hamilton, Clark, and others have stated this argument with great learning and force. It has, however, been regarded by many theologians and metaphysicians as inconclusive, and calculated to perplex, rather than to produce rational conviction. In the present state of the discussion respecting the existence of God, we may set aside this method of proof, not as having been exploded, but as being replaced by other and more satisfactory arguments. The term a posteriori is now seldom used, although the argument itself, i. e., from effect (seen and known) to cause (unseen and unknown), remains in full force, but is presented under other names.

Prof. Baden Powell, speaking of the operations in "the laboratory of nature," where the results are seen, while the processes are invisible, says: "Mind, directing the operations of the laboratory or workshop, is no part of the visible apparatus, nor are its operations seen in themselves: they are visible only in their effects; and from effects, however dissimilar in magnitude or in kind, yet agreeing in the one condition of order, adjustment, and profound and recondite connection and dependence, there is the same evidence and outward manifestation of Invisible Intelligence, as vast and illimitable as the universe throughout which these manifestations are seen." The inference of design, intention, forethought, implies intelligent agency or moral causation. Hence, again, we advance to the notion of distinct existence, or what is called personality; and thence proceed to ascribe the other Divine attributes or perfections as centering in that independent Being.

3. Conscience -- consciousness -- often called the Moral Argument. --

The sense of responsibility and accountability; the distinction

between right and wrong; the operations of that mystery of our being which we call "conscience," -- all involve necessarily the existence of a personal Being (not a mere abstract entity), who is superior to man, who is the Authoritative and supreme Lawgiver and Judge, who has graven His law of right and wrong upon man's heart, and to whom he is accountable for his conduct. Conscience is the great root of Theism. It is something supernatural within the natural, and there is no separating these two spheres if we are true to psychology. The webs of the natural and the supernatural are so interwoven in the soul that they cannot be untied.

It follows inevitably that if we are the subjects of moral law, there must be a moral lawgiver. He must be a Being, not an abstraction; a Person, not a mere stream of influence; a something more than "The Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness."

Conscience forbodes punishment and anticipates reward; and this not only among those who have received instruction, but it applies universally to savage and civilized man. The sense of dependence and of obligation implies the existence of a some-one and not a some-what. "Conscience and the Consciousness of God, i. e. a personal Being, are one." (Matthew Arnold.)

4. Revelation.

While Intuition; the evidence of purpose in nature; the instinctive consciousness of right and wrong -- the sense of dependence and moral accountability -- all go to demonstrate the existence of a Being who possesses intelligence and will, who gives us laws, and to whom we are accountable, and who from the very nature of the case must be a person; -- yet it is only by Revelation from God Himself that we can have any adequate knowledge of His nature and attributes. The Scriptures never attempt to prove the existence of God -- that is assumed as a self-evident truth; but they reveal Him to us as the Author and Source of all things (Isa. 40:21; Acts 17:26-29; Rom. 1:20; Psalm 19:1-3), as exercising a direct personal, intelligent superintendence over the Universe; and as bearing the relation to His accountable creatures of Father, Judge, and Sovereign. [illegible]

over the Universe; and as bearing the relation to His accountable creatures of Father, Judge, and Sovereign. Prov. 8:27-29; Job 38:9-12. Revelation emphatically declares God to be a Living Being -- not a mere abstraction, or influence, or force, or energy. The highest words of Scripture concerning the Supreme Being are, "God is Spirit;" "God is Light;" "God is Love." Holding fast to this conception of God as thus revealed to us, we have an idea which satisfies every demand of the intellect, and every claim of the heart; we, therefore, refuse to be entangled with the mere metaphysical discussions about "The Absolute," or the "Infinite," or the "Unconditioned," on the one hand; or the scientific negations about "The Unknowable," or "The Inscrutable," or the "Infinite and Eternal Energy by which all things exist," on the other hand, as advanced by modern Agnostics.

To sum up the various arguments which we have presented, the conclusion appears inevitable, that the First Cause of all things must be personal, that there is behind ourselves and all things that we see and know, a Mind, a Reason, a Will, like our own, only incomparably greater. The evidence of this is seen in the works of nature in the common consent of mankind; is felt in man's inner consciousness, and his sense of moral accountability. The God of the Scriptures and the First Cause of true science are One.

"There is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." (I. Cor. 8:6) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." "God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." "I and my Father are one."

SECTION III.

CAN GOD BE KNOWN?

Having considered the authority in favor of the existence of God, we come now to consider the question, Can God be known? and if so, How, that is, How does the mind proceed in forming its idea of God, and how do we know that God really is what we believe He is?

It is the clear doctrine of the Scriptures that God can be known. Our Lord teaches that eternal life consists in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, whom He hath sent. The Psalmist says, "In Judah is God known." (Psa. 76:1) Isaiah predicts that, "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord." (Isa. 11:9) Paul says even of the heathen, that they knew God, but did not like to retain the knowledge (Rom. 1:19-28).

1. It is, however, important distinctly to understand what is meant when it is said, God can be known. This does not mean that we can know all that is true concerning God. There were some among the ancient philosophers who taught that the nature of God can be so fully understood and determined as any other object of knowledge. The modern speculative school teaches the same thing. Spinoza, Hegel, Cousin, and Schelling all teach "that God is, only so as He is known." "That man knows God only so far as God knows Himself in man." Of course, it is in no such sense as this that the Scriptures and the church teach that God can be known.

2. It is not held that God, properly speaking, can be conceived of; that is, we cannot form a mental image of God. "All conception," says Mansel, "implies imagination." We have a mental conception of a horse, he adds, we must be able "to combine" the attributes which form "the definition of the animal" into "a representative image." Conception is defined by Taylor in the same manner, as "the forming or bringing an idea or image into the mind by an effort of the will." In this sense it must be admitted that the Infinite is not an object of knowledge. [illegible]

an image of infinite power, or of infinite duration, or of an infinite whole. We form an image in to limit, to circumscribe. But the infinite is that which is incapable of limitation. It is evident, therefore, that the infinite God is inconceivable. We can form no representative image of Him in our minds. The word, however, is often, and perhaps commonly, used in a less restricted sense. To conceive is to think. A conception is, therefore, a thought, and not necessarily an image. To say, therefore, that God is conceivable, in common language, is merely to say that He is thinkable. That is, that the thought (or idea) of God involves no contradiction or impossibility. We cannot think of a round square, or that a part is equal to the whole. But we can think that God is infinite and eternal.

5. When it is said that God can be known, it is not meant that He can be comprehended. To comprehend is to have a complete and exhaustive knowledge of an object. It is to understand its nature and its relations. We cannot comprehend force, and especially vital force. We see its effect, but we cannot understand its nature or the mode in which it acts. It would be strange that we should know more of God than of the most familiar objects of sense or even of ourselves. God is past finding out. We cannot by searching find Him out to perfection (Job. 11:7-8). To comprehend is (1) To know the essense as well as the attributes of an object. (2) It is to know not some only, but all of its attributes. (3) To know the relation in which those attributes stand to each other and to the substance to which they belong. (4) To know the relation in which the object known stands to all other objects. Such knowledge is clearly impossible in a creature, either of itself or of anything out of itself. It is, however, substantially thus that the transcendentalists claim to know God.

4. It is included in what has been said, that our knowledge of God is partial and inadequate. There is infinitely more in God than we have any idea of; and what we know, we know imperfectly. We know that God knows; but there is much in His mode of knowing, and in its relation to the

objects, which we cannot understand. We know that [illegible] know how He acts, or the relation which His [illegible] things outside of Himself. We know that He feels; that He loves, pities, is merciful, is long suffering, is gracious; that He hates sin. But this emotional element of the divine nature is covered with an obscurity as great, but no greater, than that which rests over His thoughts or purposes. Here again our ignorance, or rather, the limitation of our knowledge concerning God, finds a parallel in our ignorance of ourselves. There are potentialities in our nature of which, in our present state of existence, we have no idea. And even as to what we are now, we know but little. We know that we perceive, think, and act; we do not know how. It is perfectly inscrutable to us how the mind takes cognizance of matter; how the soul acts on the body, or the body on the mind. But because our knowledge of ourselves is thus partial and imperfect, no sane man would assert that we have no self-knowledge.

While, therefore, it is admitted not only that the infinite God is incomprehensible, and that our knowledge of Him is both partial and imperfect; that there is much in God which we do not know at all, and that what we do know, we know very imperfectly; nevertheless our knowledge, as far as it goes, is true knowledge. God really is what we believe Him to be, so far as our idea of Him is determined by the revelation which He has made of Himself in His works, in the constitution of our nature, in His word, and in the person of His Son. To know is to have such apprehensions of an object as to conform to what that object really is. We know what the word Spirit means. We know what the words infinite, eternal, and immutable, mean. And, therefore, the sublime proposition, pregnant with more truth than was ever compressed in any other sentence, "God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and immutable," conveys to the mind as distinct an idea, and as true (i. e. trustworthy) knowledge, as the proposition "The human soul is a finite spirit." In this sense God is an object of knowledge. He is not the unknown

God, because he is infinite. Knowledge in Him does not cease to be power, not cease to be power because it is omnipotence; any more than space ceases to be space because it is infinite.

5. How then does the mind proceed in forming its image of God? The older theologians answered this question by saying that it is by the way of negation, by the way of eminence, and by the way of causality. That is, we deny to God any limitation; we ascribe to Him every excellence in the highest degree; and we refer to Him as the great First Cause every attribute manifested in His works. We are the children of God, and, therefore, we are like Him. We are, therefore, authorized to ascribe to Him all the attributes of our own nature as rational beings, without limitation, and to an infinite degree. If we are like God, God is like us. This is the fundamental principle of all religion. This is the principle which Paul assumed in his address to the Athenians (Acts 17:29): "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art or Man's device." The likeness we bear to our Heavenly Father is not the likeness of a creature to a creator, but the likeness of a child to its father. Our Saviour, in that marvelous formula of prayer He gave us, said, "When ye pray, say, 'Our Father which art in heaven, etc.'" (Luke 11:2) [illegible].

Thus we are reminded of the relationship between us and our Father in heaven. For this reason we are not to think that He is a simple being, or a mere abstraction, a name for the moral order of the universe, or the unknown and unknowable cause of all things, - mere inscrutable force. If we are His children, He is our Father, whose image we bear, and of whose nature we partake. This, in the proper sense of the word, is anthropomorphism, a word much abused, and often used in a bad sense to express the idea that God is altogether such a one as ourselves, a being of like limitations and passions. In the sense, however, just explained, it expresses the doctrine of the church and the great [illegible] of [illegible], because [illegible]

This method of forming an idea [illegible]

It is a law of our nature. Even in the [illegible] of the worshipper is assumed to belong to the object which he worships. The power dreaded is assumed to possess attributes like our own. In like manner under all the forms of polytheism, the gods of the people have been intelligent personal agents. Our conviction that God is what He has revealed Himself to be, rests on the same foundation as our conviction that the external world is what we take it to be. That foundation is the veracity of consciousness, or the trustworthiness of the laws of belief which God has impressed upon our nature. According to Sir William Hamilton, "Invincibility of belief is convertible with the truth of belief." "That what is by nature necessarily believed to be, truly is." No man has more nobly or more earnestly vindicated this doctrine, which is the foundation of all faith and of all science. It is true, therefore, that God really is what we take Him to be, when we ascribe to Him the perfections of our own nature, without limitation, and to an infinite degree. (2) Our moral nature demands this idea of God. It has already been shown, when speaking of the moral argument for the existence of God, that all men are conscious of their accountability to a being superior to themselves, who knows what they are and what they do, and who has the will and purpose to reward or punish men according to their works. The God, therefore, who is revealed to us in our nature, is a God who knows, and wills, and acts; who rewards and punishes. That is He is a person; an intelligent, voluntary agent, endowed with moral attributes. This revelation of God must be true. It must make known to us what God really is, or our nature is a lie. Our argument from these facts is, that if our moral nature compels us to believe that God is a person, He must be a person, and consequently that we arrive at a true knowledge of God by attributing to Him the perfections of our own nature. Our religious nature makes the same demand. The argument from our religious, as distinct from our moral nature, is essentially the same. Morality is not all of religion. The one is [illegible] law and [illegible] of our nature as the other. To worship, in the religious sense of the word, is to ascribe infinite perfection to its object. It is to express to that object

our acknowledgments for the blessings we enjoy, and to [illegible] ance; it is to confess, and praise, and [illegible] ship the law of gravity, or unconscious force, [illegible] universe. Our religious nature, in demanding an object of [illegible] love, and confidence, demands a personal God, a God clothed with the attributes of a nature like our own; who can hear our confessions, praises, and prayers; who can love and be loved; who can supply our wants, and fill all our capacities for good. Thus again it appears that unless our whole nature is a contradiction and a falsehood, we arrive at a true knowledge of God when we ascribe to Him the perfections of our own nature. (3) The revelation of God in nature is another argument in favor of the proposition we are now considering. The works of God in the physical world manifests a nature like our own. It is a sound principle that we must refer to a cause the attributes necessary to account for its effects. If the effects manifest intelligence, will power, moral excellence, these attributes must belong to the cause. As, therefore, the works of God are a revelation of all these attributes on a most stupendous scale, they must belong to God in an infinite degree. This is only saying that the revelation made of God in the eternal world agrees with the revelation which He has made of Himself in the constitution of our own nature. In other words, it proves that the image of Himself, which He has enstamped on our nature, is a true likeness. (4) The Scriptures declare God to be just what we are led to think He is, when we ascribe to Him the perfections of our own nature in an infinite degree. We are self-conscious, so is God. We are spirits, so is He. We are voluntary agents, so is God. We have a moral nature, miserably defaced indeed; God has moral excellence in infinite perfection. We are [illegible], so is God. All this the Scriptures declare to be true. The great primal revelation of God is as the "I am," the personal God. All the [illegible] titles given to Him; all the attributes ascribed to Him; all the works attributed to Him, are revelations of what He truly is. He is the [illegible], the [illegible],

the Omnipresent Spirit. He is the creator; the [illegible], the [illegible] of all things. He is our Father. He is the hearer of [illegible]; the [illegible] of all good. He feeds the young ravens. He clothes the flowers of the field. "Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." (Ps. 145:16) He is Love. He so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life. He is merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth. He is a present help in every time of need, a refuge, a high tower, an exceeding great reward. The relations in which, according to the Scriptures, we stand to God, are such as we can sustain only to a being who is like ourselves. He is our ruler, and father, with whom we can commune. His favor is our life, His loving-kindness better than life. This sublime revelation of God in His own nature and in His relation to us is not a delusion. It is not a mere regulative truth, or it would be a deceit and a mockery. It makes God known to us as He really is. We, therefore, know God, although no creature can understand the Almighty unto perfection. (5) Finally, God has revealed Himself in the person of His Son. No man knoweth the Father but the Son; and he to whom the Son shall reveal Him. Jesus Christ is the true God. The revelation which He made of Himself was the manifestation of God. He and the Father are one. The words of Christ are the words of God. The works of Christ are the works of God. The love, mercy, tenderness, the forgiving grace, as well as the holiness, the severity and power manifested by Christ, were all manifestations of what God really is. We see, therefore, as with our own eyes, what God truly is. We know that though infinite and absolute, He can think, act, will; that He can love and hate; that He can hear prayer and forgive sin; that we can have fellowship with Him, as one person can commune with another. Philosophy must veil her face in the presence of Jesus Christ, as God manifest in the flesh. She may not presume in that presence to say that God is not, and is not to be known to be, what Christ himself most clearly was. This doctrine that God is the object of [illegible] and true knowl-

edge lies at the foundation of all religion, and therefore must never be abandoned. The conclusion, therefore, of the whole matter is, that we know God in the same sense in which we know ourselves and the thing out of ourselves. We have the same conviction that God is, and that He is, in Himself, and independently of our thought of Him, what we take Him to be. Our subjective idea corresponds to the objective reality.

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest (unveil or make known) myself to him." "I and my Father are one." "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

CHAPTER III.

DIVINE REVELATION.

1. What are we to understand by Divine Revelation?

Revelation means to unfold, to disclose, to communicate. Divine Revelation means the communication by God to man, in certain ways and for certain ends, the secrets of His will and nature.

The Book of Nature is a Divine Revelation, which makes manifest the existence of God, His natural attributes, His works, and awakens man's sense of obligation or accountability to Him. Supernatural revelation, in a theological sense, is the communication of sacred truth to man, which could not have been known from the Book of Nature, or by any process of human reasoning, or by the exercise of his faculties without the assistance of supernatural means. "A Divine Revelation is a discovery by God to man of Himself, of His will, over and above what He has made known by the light of reason." (Horne)

We have, then, in our hands a book that professes to be a revelation of truth and duty given by God to man; a book whose last page was written nearly two thousand years ago; a book that has been transcribed by numberless pens, translated into many languages, scrutinized by the scholar, and loved and reverenced by millions. We must consider the evidences by which this particular record is commended to our faith.

2. Is there any reason for perplexity among the numerous pretended revelations that are found amongst men?

Infidels have always been accustomed to say much concerning false religions, in order to throw discredit upon the true one. They have proved thus: "Every nation in the world pretends to a revealed religion. Each community has its own, which boasts its irresistible proofs, its miracles, its prophets. To believe them all is impossible, since they contradict and anathematise each other; and to discriminate between them is equally impossible, for were there a true revelation it would be vain to attempt the discovery

of it in the midst of so much confusion." Now, how numerous soever the religions may be which falsely boast their divine origin, this is no proof that a true revelation does not somewhere exist. On the contrary, so many groundless pretensions are an evidence that a just claim has somewhere exist. No one would have made counterfeit money, had not the true coin first existed; and charlatans in policies only exert their influence over the minds of the people, because there are physicians and real remedies. So if God had not spoken to man, what Rousseau calls "the phantasy of revelations" would never have had its rise. And thus, instead of concluding that there is no true revelation because there are so many false ones, we should say that there are so many false ones because there is a true revelation. And it is a great mistake to suppose that the task of discovering the true religion is perplexing and impracticable. Of course, it would be idle to allege against us the claims of such religions as have no written testimony, and of which anything may be affirmed that fancy or caprice can suggest. We must confine ourselves to those revelations which have a written evidence; and of these how many are worthy to be put in competition with the Bible? We are referred to the so-called <u>revelation of Zoroaster.</u> <u>The Zend-Vesta.</u> But even were not tradition involved in so much uncertainty as to reckon as many as six different persons by this name, and were not the authenticity of the Zend-Vesta a contested point, as is the case, still this book is rather a treatise of theology, philosophy, and other matters than a professed revelation. The author is less a false prophet than a legislator; and he may be compared to Solon and Lycurgus of Greece, who invoked the authority of the gods in support of their laws without declaring themselves to be prophets. As to Confucius, he lays so little claim to this character, that the books of which he is considered the author are especially distinguished by the fact that no trace of the doctrine of a Divinity, or of a future state, is to be found in them. The Hindoos also possess books which they profess to believe to be inspired, but the origin of these books is anything but authentic. The most impenetrable mystery covers their origin.

We find, in fact, no religion which claims Divine [illegible] well known writers cross to these three: that of Moses, of Jesus Christ, and of Mohammed, and all these claim from the same source. The religion of Jesus Christ is based on that of Moses, and Mohammed proceeds to meet the claims of the other two, Moses and Christ.

The Old Testament - the most ancient book in existence -- clearly proclaims its Divine inspiration; and it is from this common head that all accredited revelations, whether true or false, have their rise; and among st these there are only three whose authority it is either possible or necessary to bring to the test. The inquiry is thus brought within very narrow limits; for the Jewish and Christian religions hold together in such a manner that if the second is of God, the first, to which it bears testimony, must be of God also. They are one: they must stand or fall together. And the Christian religion is so strongly opposed to Mohammedanism that if the one is Divine, the other cannot be so.

Let us, then, examine the claims of the Christian religion, and of the documents on which it rests, namely, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We maintain that they not only contain, but are, a revelation from God. And the evidences by which this is proved are usually distributed under these general heads: Presumptive, Historical, Direct, Internal, and Miscellaneous.

<u>The Presumptive Evidences.</u>-- These are certain facts, or preliminary considerations which yield a presumption in favor of such a revelation, and which may fairly predispose us to examine its more direct and proper proofs. These facts relate to the necessity, the possibility, and probability of an express revelation from God.

<u>3. Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation Necessary?</u>

Modern infidels assert that the light of nature will suffice to conduct mankind to truth and virtue and happiness. This point can be easily tested by an inquiry into the state of those nations which are altogether

without revelation, either real or pretended. It would not be fair to refer to systems of Natural Theology which have been framed in Christian lands, even though the men who framed them were avowed opponents of the Bible; for their best views and precepts have been derived, not from the dictates of their own unassisted reason, but, as the infidel Rousseau himself confesses, from those very Scriptures which they revile and despise, from the early impression of education, and from living in a country where, in spite of themselves, they imbibe some portion of that religious knowledge which the Scriptures have everywhere diffused. If the inquiry really be concerning the sufficiency of natural light without a direct revelation, we ought, in all justice, to confine ourselves to those, whether in ancient or modern times, who have enjoyed the light of nature alone; or, at most, the light of nature with a few faint rays of early traditionary revelation. Examine, then, the most authentic records concerning the religion and morals of the heathen world. Bring forward as witnesses the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome. Let our inquiries relate to the time when the human mind was in a condition of strength and culture, quite equal, if not superior, to anything developed in the history of the world. And what is the result? Did man, simply by his own unaided reason, rise to a right conception of his Maker? Did he discover the true relation in which he stood to the Supreme? Was he able to tell with certainty whether there was pardon for the guilty, or whether there was power in prayer? Did he erect an infallible standard of morality, and exercise a steady belief in a future state of being? In short, without the Bible, did he realise and fulfil the great end for which he was created, and all this in a way conducive to his own happiness as an immortal being, and in harmony with the principles of the Divine government and the character of God. Alas! all history testifies that "the world by wisdom knew not God;" that the most eminent of heathen philosophers never rose above a gloomy skepticism or a low and revolting idolatry; and that vice in its most revolting [illegible], not in

solitary and isolated cases, but under the [illegible] religion, and its [illegible] [illegible]

Heathen writers themselves testify that the greatest crimes were countenanced by the arguments and examples of their moralists and philosophers. Infanticide, theft, and crimes against nature, the detail of which modesty forbids, were not only tolerated, but even enjoined by their legislators and praised by their poets. This would not have been had not public opinion consented to and, in some measure, invited them. Even their so-called religions sanctioned gross vices. In Corinth was a temple of Venus, with a thousand female votaries bringing to her treasury the gains of their impurity. The Babylonians had a temple to which every virgin was religiously taught to resort for unchaste purposes. Socrates made morality the only subject of his philosophy, yet he recommended divination, and was himself addicted to fornication. Plato, the great disciple of Socrates, taught that to lie was honorable. Seneca, as favorable a speciman of heathen excellence as can be found, winks at fornication, and commends, and at last practices suicide. Cato, extolled as a perfect model of virtue, was guilty of prostitution and drunkeness, and advocated, and finally practiced, self-murder. Such was the moral condition of the ancient heathen; from which we argue the necessity of something superior to the religion of nature.

The moral condition of <u>modern heathen</u> is further proof of this necessity. The inhabitants of Ceylon worship devils. The Hindus acknowledge one Supreme Being, but never worship him. Their writings encourage self-murder, human sacrifices, and the burning of widows to an alarming extent. The Chinese burn gold paper before their idols, supposing it will become money in another world, and help the departed spirits of the poor to pay their way to heaven. And what have the modern opposers of revelation given us to prove that our unaided reason, the light of nature, will serve us better than it has done the men, even the wisest, of other ages? What can we find in their writings which may be regarded as a perfect rule of

duty, or an infallible standard of truth? With no guide for man but that which the opponents of revelation have attempted to furnish, his condition would indeed be sad and unmeaning, perplexing and hopeless. If men are not altogether blinded by prejudice or passion, if they are not quite either deaf to the voice of history, they cannot but see the inadequacy of human reason to the moral necessities of man. We need a revelation: this the philosophers of antiquity painfully felt; and this every thoughtful spirit will feel, who, like them is left to the misery of mere conjecture on the most momentous subjects connected with human happiness.

4. Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation Possible?

Revelation is distinguished into Oral and Written. By oral is meant traditional, or such as is transmitted by word of mouth from one generation to another. Such were the revelations made to the patriarchs, and the longevity peculiar to that age served to preserve them from being corrupted. These original truths were thus handed down to Moses, who, by direction of God on Sinai, finally wrote them in five books, called the Pentateuch. These are all supported by the combined testimony of universal tradition, history, and modern science. Of these facts which preceded his time he had ample means of information in the longevity of the ancients. Moses was contemporary with the contemporaries of Abraham; Abraham with Noah; Noah with the contemporaries of Adam. Under divine guidance, in this way, the important facts; - the creation of the world: of man; of primeval happiness; his fall; promise of a Saviour; the deluge; preservation of a few; Babel; the call of Abraham; the bondage of Israel; the exodus; and the giving of the law were gathered by Moses except that portion which fell under his own personal observation.

An extraordinary action of God upon the human mind, which the word inspiration is now used to denote, is not more inconceivable than the ordinary action of mind on body or of body on mind; and those who allege the impossibility of a Divine revelation to man should in all fairness show

where the impossibility lies. Is it in God? Is He not a Being of unbounded and amazing power? and whatever difficulties may be involved in a Divine revelation, are they such as omnipotence cannot overcome? Is the alleged impossibility in man? Has he not perception, judgment, and will sufficient, if rightly directed, to apprehend and embrace what God may be pleased to reveal? To deny this were to deny the gift of our intellectual and rational nature, and to degrade ourselves to a level with the brutes. (Psa. 4:9-30) Or, does the impossibility lie in the discovery of a proper medium of communication? Shall we suppose that He, who formed man, and endowed him with intelligence, is unable to devise a way by signs, inspiration, language, or the life, to disclose to him His mind and purposes? If we ourselves can in various ways transmit our inward thoughts, and sentiments, and feelings to each other, can we with reason entertain the thought that God, who has supplied us with this faculty, is ever at a loss to convey to us by some most efficient and intelligent medium, the knowledge of His will and designs? We must surrender ourselves to the baldest Atheism before we can deny that He can, if He desires, make a communication of Himself and His will, and accompany it with evidences sufficiently clear to convince every lover of truth of its credibility and authority.

5. Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation Probable?

The general persuasion of mankind is an argument strongly in favor of this supposition. For we shall scarcely find a people that believed in the existence of a God, who did not likewise believe that some kind of communication already subsisted between God and man, or would at some future time be vouchsafed to dispel the cloud of darkness in which they were involved. But further than this; all our acquaintance with the Divine nature leads to the conclusion that He will concede to His rational and responsible creatures -- His children -- a communication of His nature and will. He would be an unnatural father, if He should not speak to His children. He is a holy God, infinitely and eternally holy; and it is in the nature of holiness

to desire in all others a resemblance to itself, and to hold all impurity, wherever it exists, in utter abhorrence. But if our heavenly Father desires us to be holy, He will undoubtedly supply us with every necessary assistance; for it is altogether inconceivable that a wise and gracious Father should will an end without willing also the means essential to that end. He is a God of goodness also. "The goodness of God endureth continually." It arrays the lilies of the field, marks the fall of the sparrow, numbers the hairs of our head, feeds the fowls of the air. "Thou openest thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." (Psalm 145:16.) Man, as the chief and prince of this lower world, partakes of the especial care and bounty of the Most High. And shall his best and highest interests be disregarded? Shall his body be fed, and his soul be left to starve? Shall he find plentiful provision for time, and none for eternity? Is this the lesson which divine goodness teaches? Is this the conclusion to which its past and present manifestations guide us? Surely it may be presumed, with Socrates, however the modern infidel may doubt it, that He, the loving Father of our spirits, will break the awful silence, and speak to man in the voice of love whatever may be necessary to his present and eternal well being.

If, then, these considerations afford presumptive evidence in favor of a revelation from God, the next enquiry relates to the historical evidences of the credibility of the Scriptures.

The volume that is offered us as a revelation from God is the Bible. The word Bible signifies book. Scripture is a term which in its ordinary sense includes all writings. The Bible and The Scriptures are so called by way of eminence, as the most important of all books and writings.

The Bible consists of two parts, the Old and the New Testaments, that is, Covenants or Agreements. In the New Testament the term Oracles signifies truths supernaturally revealed, and is another name for the Holy Scriptures. (Rom. 3:2) In the Old Testament Oracle signifies the place where Jehovah made known His will -- usually the holy of holies. (2 Sam. 16:23)

The New Testament lies concealed in the Old: the Old Testament [illegible] in the New.

The Old Testament contains 39 books. These were written by inspired men, at different times, and were collected into one volume by Ezra, a noted high-priest and scribe. The New Testament contains 27 books -- five of the first are historical, twenty-one following. These are doctrinal, and the last one prophetical.

A book is genuine if it was written by the person whose name it bears.

A book is authentic when it relates matters of fact as they really happened.

A book is called Canonical when it comes up to the required standard; when it does not it is uncanonical, or spurious.

The Order of the arrangement of both Testaments has less regard to the period of their writing than to the subjects they treat. The books of the Old Testament were written between 1490 B. C., the date of the five books of Moses, and 430 B. C., the date of Malachi, the last of the prophets. The books of the New Testament were written between A. D. 50, the probable date of the Gospel by Matthew, and A. D. 95, the date of the Revelation by John, so that it was completed within sixty years after the crucifixion of Christ.

6. Have we sufficient Proof of the Genuineness of the Sacred Scriptures?

The word genuine has relation only to authorship. Is it the legitimate production of the person to whom it is ascribed? Now, the greater part of the books of the Bible plainly appropriate the names of their respective writers, but some do not, while yet they claim to be the genuine productions of competent persons, though undetermined or unknown. We must keep this distinction before us, and by the ordinary rules of criticism, the same rules that we apply to the records of ancient literature, test the genuineness of the Sacred Scriptures. [illegible]

to the Old Testament is, of course, distinct from that of the [illegible] and will be considered separately.

CONCERNING [illegible]

1. Those which are [illegible] to [illegible] known and certain authorship, have been received from the time of their alleged publication as the writings of the men whose names they bear; and there is not, even in contemporary authors, in the contents of the works themselves, or in the traditions by which they are accompanied, the shadow of a testimony to the contrary. And the books whose authorship is unascertained, have also been received always on a prevalent and satisfactory authority as the genuine productions of men guided by God, and thus divinely fitted to instruct the Church and the world. Besides this they afford ample internal evidence of their genuineness in their strict harmony with other parts of the Scripture, and in their uniform character. Had we no other proof we would be forced to admit the genuineness of these records. It should be remembered that the onus probandi that the books of the Scripture are not genuine and authentic lies upon the objector. We are in possession and the objector brings an act of ejectment. We have not to prove, but only to defend our case. Before we can be called upon to give up the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, positive evidence must be produced that the reasons which were sufficient to prove this in the past, are insufficient and are now outweighed by the proofs now offered in opposition. This we affirm has not been done, nor can it be done.

2. The Old Testament is in the keeping of two religious classes of men who are utterly at variance -- Jews and Christians. They have no interest in common, no ties by which they could possibly be bound in a common scheme of fraud; and yet these bodies so diverse have for ages faithfully maintained the genuineness of the Old Testament: on this point there has never been either doubt or disputation. And is it possible that [illegible] so universal could have been taken place, had not these writings been demonstrably what they profess to be?

3. We have direct testimony to the genuineness of the Old Testament; for Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, who lived at the beginning of the Christian era, and who was without temptation to state anything that was not perfectly and notoriously true, gives a catalogue of the sacred books among the Jews, in which he expressly mentions the five books of Moses, thirteen of the Prophets, and four of Hymns and Moral Precepts. Now the ancient Jews united the book of Ruth to that of Judges, made the two books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, Jeremiah and the Lamentations, and the twelve minor Prophets, respectively one book; and, therefore, the enumeration of Josephus corresponds precisely with that of our Bible today: another conclusive proof of the genuineness of the Old Testament.

4. But we have further proof on this subject in the fact that, more than three hundred years before the age of Josephus and 200 years B. C., the Jewish Scriptures were translated into Greek and placed in the celebrated Library of Alexandria, which was ~~formed~~ formed by the immediate successors of Alexander the Great. This version is commonly called the "Septuagint" and is yet in existence. This consists of the same books as those which compose the Old Testament in our Bibles, and thus we are assured that we still have those identical books, which the most ancient Jews attested as genuine; a benefit this which has not happened to any ancient profane books whatever.

5. Besides what has been advanced, the genuineness of the Old Testament is proven by a mass of internal evidence, arising from the language, style, manner of writing, and the very great number of particular circumstances of time, place, persons, etc., etc., that are mentioned. These are given in detail by Horne in his "Introduction," Vol. I. Here it should be stated that it is contended by some critics, that passages occur in some of these books that could not have been written by the persons to whom the work is attributed. A few insertions may have been made subsequently on the authority of inspired men, as Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra, and marginal glosses may have crept into the text in transcribing; but they do not affect

the proper genuineness of the record. The Pentateuch has been the chief battle-ground as to the genuineness and historical accuracy of the Old Testament Scriptures. Does any scholar ever deny the Iliad or Odyssey to be the work of Homer, because some critics and grammarians have asserted that a few verses are interpolations? And may we not say that the few instances of interpolation that have been discovered in the text of Scriptures, so far from impeaching the antiquity and genuineness of the original narative, rather confirms them. "For, if this were a compilation long subsequent to the events it records, such additions would not have been plainly distinguishable, as they now are from the main substance of the original: since the entire history would have been composed with the same ideas and views as these additions were; and such explanatory insertions would not have been made, if length of time had not rendered them necessary." — Horne.

Concerning the Books of the New Testament, ~~their~~ genuineness is a question easily determined. It is proven by the common consent of all ages of the Christian Church from the times of the apostles down to the present.

The New Testament, consisting of 27 books, was written on various occasions, and at different times and places, by eight different authors, all of whom were contemporary with Jesus Christ, viz: The Four Gospels which bear the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, the Acts of the Apostles, the fourteen Epistles which bear the name of Paul, and which are addressed to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and to the Hebrews, the Seven Epistles of James, Peter, 1, 2, and John, 1, 2, 3, and Jude, and the Book of the Revelation which bears the name of John. These writings contain the history of Jesus Christ; the first propagation of his religion, the principles of Christianity, and various precepts or rules of life. The Gospels were written at different periods, and published for different classes of believers; while the Epistles were addressed, as occasion required, to those various Christian communities, which, by the successful labors of the apostles, had been spread over the greatest part of the then known world. And also to a few private

individuals. These writings were collected together into one volume under the title of the "New Testament," or the "Canon of the New Testament." Neither the names of the persons who were concerned in making the collection, nor the exact time when it was done, can, at present, be ascertained with absolute certainty; nor is it at all necessary that we should be definitely informed concerning either of these particulars. It is sufficient for us to know that the parts of the New Testament were collected before the death of the apostle John, or soon after that event. We receive the books of the New Testament, as the genuine works of their respective authors, for the same reason that we receive the writings of Xenophon, of Polybius, of Caesar, of Tacitus, of Homer, of Eusebius, or of Mosheim; namely, because we have the uninterrupted testimony to their genuineness, and we have no good reason to suspect imposition.

8. Have we Sufficient Proof of the Authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures?

An authentic book is one that relates matters of fact as they really happened. Genuineness teaches us that a book is its alleged author's real production; authenticity teaches us that it contains the truth, and in consequence possesses authority. A book may be genuine without being authentic, and a book may be authentic without being genuine. The Holy Scriptures are not only genuine as we have shown, but, also, authentic. The facts related contain the truth, and nothing but the truth. And since these facts are inseperably identified with the other parts of the scriptures, if we establish them, we may claim to give authentication to the entire revelation.

These statements of the Bible to which this part of our inquiry refers may be classed under three general heads.

1. Such as appertain to ordinary history, and which must be judged of by the rules applicable to history in general. Such, for example, as the facts that Moses was the leader and law-giver of the Jews; that David was the second and most eminent of the Kings of Israel; that Jesus Christ was the founder of the Christian faith; that He was crucified by the order of Pilate;

that either He or the disciples extensively preached the doctrines which He taught. Now, all that is necessary to prove the truth of these statements is that they were published about the time when these facts, and those relations to them, are said to have occurred, and that they were then admitted to be authentic. It is impossible for a false or fictitious narrative of public events to be believed by those who lived in the times in which they are affirmed to have taken place. If, a thousand years hence, a question should arise as to the life and deeds of George Washington, it will be a sufficient proof that the narratives of his achievement as soldier and statesman were published and received universally in our time. Thus, therefore, we prove the truth of Scripture history in general: because we have abundant proof that it was published and admitted about the time when its events are said to have occurred.

2. Such as narrate public occurrences of a supernatural character:- The plagues of Egypt, the parting of the Red Sea, the manna, the passage of the Jordan, the preternatural darkness, with the other phenomena, attendant upon the crucifixion of our Lord. Here, also, the evidence of the genuineness of the books of the Bible is a sufficient proof of their authenticity; for if those facts and their relations were published while multitudes were alive who witnessed these facts as they transpired, it is manifestly impossible that any narrative could have been received which was not strictly true.

3. Such as we believe principally upon the testimony of the writers of the Scriptures:- For example, a large proportion of the teachings and miracles of our Lord, and the incidents of His private life, the miracles of the apostles, etc.,etc. Here we have testimony that is every way trustworthy, abundantly sufficient to command our faith. We confine our remarks to the New Testament:- (a) The witnesses were in a position to judge accurately concerning the facts which they relate. (b) Their character was such as to preclude the possibility of fraud. They were men of most eminent integrity, followers of one "who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth."

Their purity, virtue and self-denial, all belie the supposition of their having spent their lives in the attestation of a known falsehood, in the name and with the pretended authority of the God of truth. (c) They had no interest in making their statements good. All deceivers have some object in view, which, by their imposture, they expect to accomplish. What, then, was the object here? Why, the forfeiture of all the good on which men in general set their hearts, and the endurance of the evils from which human nature revolts, and to which no sane man that could help it would expose himself. At the same time, in the very doctrine which they promulgate in connection with the alleged facts, they doom themselves, as conscious impostors and liars, to the damnation of hell. And it would be an utter outrage on all the common principles and feelings of our nature to suppose men thus to relinquish good, and to encounter evils, in attestation of what they know to be false. (d) Their testimony is in harmony with contemporary history. They are most minute and circumstantial in their narratives, giving dates, names of persons, places, and very many other things, which, had there been any purpose to deceive, would certainly have been omitted, since every one of them supplied facilities for detection. And yet their statements are confirmed by the testimony of profane historians, by the public and national records of the time, and even by the bitterest enemies of the Christian religion. For the reasons we have given we are warranted in affirming that the facts recorded in the Holy Scriptures are accredited to a degree to which no other narratives can make the slightest pretensions, and consequently are entitled to our most implicit faith.

CHAPTER V.

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE?

Inspiration literally signifies a breathing into: and it denotes "that extraordinary agency of the Holy Spirit on the mind, in consequence of which the person who partakes of it is enabled to embrace and communicate the truth of God without error, infirmity or defect." (Hannah) "Divine Inspiration is the imparting of such a degree of Divine or intellect, influence, or guidance, as should enable the authors of the Scriptures to communicate religious knowledge to others without error or mistake whether the subjects of such communications were things then immediately revealed to those who declared them, or things with which they were before acquainted." (Horne) (2 Sam. 23:2; 2 Peter 1:21). From these it will be seen that the inspiration of which we now speak is to be distinguished from the inspiration of genius -- the inspiration of a Plato, a Bacon, or a Shakespeare. This refers to the workings of nature in her highest sphere, but still of nature, and of nature only. While spiritual inspiration is supernatural and miraculous, revealing truths above nature, shedding clear unerring light on a path on which all earthly guidance fails.

The common doctrine of the Church is, and ever has been, that inspiration was an influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of certain men, which rendered them the organs of God for the infallible communication of His mind and will. They were in such a sense the organs of God, that what they said God said.

This definition includes several distinct points. (1) Inspiration is a supernatural influence. It is distinguished, on the one hand, from the providential agency of God, which is everywhere and always in operation: and on the other hand from the gracious operations of the Spirit on the hearts of His people. The Bible makes an obvious distinction between the gracious operations of the Spirit and those by which extraordinary, or supernatural

gifts are bestowed upon particular individuals. Inspiration is not, therefore, to be confounded with spiritual illumination. They differ as to their subjects. The subjects of inspiration are a few selected persons; the subjects of spiritual illumination are all true believers. Again, they differ as to their design. The design of inspiration is to render certain men infallible as teachers; the design of spiritual illumination is to render men holy; and of course they differ as to their effects. Inspiration in itself has no sactifying influence. Balaam was inspired. Saul was among the prophets. Caiaphas uttered a prediction which "he spake not of himself." (John 11:51). In the last day many will be able to say to Christ, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils," etc. (Matt. 7:22-23) (2) There is a difference between revelation and inspiration. They differ as to their object. The object of revelation is the communication of knowledge. The object or design of inspiration is to secure infallibility in teaching. They differ, secondly, in their effects. The effect of revelation was to render its recipient wiser. The effect of inspiration was to preserve the recipient from error in teaching. These two gifts were often enjoyed by the same person at the same time. That is, the Spirit often imparted knowledge, and controlled in its communication orally or in writing to others. This was no doubt the case with the Teachers, and often with the Prophets and Apostles. Often, however, the revelations were made at one time, and were subsequently, under the guidance of the Spirit, committed to writing. Thus Paul tells us that he received his knowledge of the gospel not from man, but by revelation from Jesus Christ; and this knowledge he communicated from time to time in his discourses and epistles. In many cases these gifts were separated. Many of the sacred writers, although inspired, received no revelations. This was probably the fact with the authors of the historical books of the Old Testament. The evangelist Luke does not refer his knowledge of the events which he records to revelation made to him, but says he derived it from those which from the

beginning were eyewitnesses or "ministers of the Word." (Luke 1:2) It is immaterial to us where Moses obtained his knowledge of the events recorded in the Book of Genesis; whether from ancient documents, from tradition, or from direct revelation. If the sacred writers had sufficient sources of knowledge in themselves, or in those about them, there is no need to assume any direct revelation. It is enough for us that they were conferred infallible as teachers. (3) Inspired men were the organs of God, so that what they taught, God taught. When God uses any of His creatures as His instruments, He uses them according to their nature. He uses angels as angels, men as men, elements as elements. Men are intelligent voluntary agents: and as such were made the organs of God. The sacred writers were not machines. Their self-consciousness was not suspended, nor were their intellectual powers superseded. The spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets. (I Cor. 14:32) It was men, not unconscious instruments, but living, thinking, willing minds whom the spirit used as His organs. "Holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Moreover, as inspiration did not involve the suspension or suppression of the human faculties, so neither did it interfere with the free exercise of the distinctive mental characteristics of the individual. If a Hebrew was inspired, he spoke Hebrew; if a Greek, he spoke Greek; if an educated man, he spoke as a man of culture: if uneducated, he spoke as such a man is wont to speak. If his mind was logical, he reasoned, as did Paul; if emotional and contemplative, he wrote as John did. It lies in the very nature of inspiration that God spoke in the language of men; that He used men as His organs, each according to his peculiar gifts and endowments. Nevertheless, and none the less, they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

This is the Scriptural view of inspiration: that inspired men were the organs of God in such a sense that their words are to be received not as the words of men, but as they are in truth, as the words of God. (I Thes. 2:13) This idea of inspiration is further proved from the meaning of the word prophet. The sacred writers divide the world into two classes, "the law and the

prophets." As the law was written by Moses, and as Moses was the greatest of the prophets, it follows that all of the Old Testament was written by prophets. If, therefore, we can determine the Scriptural idea of a prophet, we shall thereby determine the character of their writings and the authority due to them. A prophet, then, in the Scriptural sense of the term, is a spokesman, one who speaks for another, in his name, and by his authority; so that it is not the spokesman, but the person for whom he acts, who is responsible for the truth of what is said. In Exodus 7:1, it is said, "See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet," that is thy spokesman. This is explained also in Exodus 4:14-16. (See also Jeremiah 36:17-18). This determines definitely what a prophet is. He is the mouth of God; one through whom God speaks to the people; so that what the prophet says God says. (Jer. 1:9; Isaiah 5:1-16). That this is the Scriptural idea of a prophet is evident from the formulas continually recurring, which relate to his duties and mission. He was the messenger of God; he spoke in the name of God; the words, "Thus saith the Lord," or words of similar import, were continually in his mouth. This is precisely what the Apostle Peter teaches when he says (2 Peter 1:20-21), "No prophecy, etc." Prophecy, that is what a prophet said was not human, but divine. It was not the prophet's own interpretation of the mind and will of God. He spoke as the organ of the Holy Ghost.

Another decisive proof that the sacred writers were the organs of God in the sense above stated, that whatever they said the Spirit is declared to have said. Christ himself said that David by the Spirit called the Messiah Lord (Matt. 22:43). David in the 95th Psalm said, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart;" but the Apostle (Heb. 3:7) says that these were the words of the Holy Ghost. Again in Heb. 10:15 the same Apostle says, "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord." Thus quoting the language of Jeremiah 31:33, as the

learnings of the Holy Ghost. In Acts 4:24, the assembled apostles said, "with one accord," "Lord thou art God, . . . who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage?" In Acts 28:25, Paul said to the Jews, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers." It is in this way that Christ and the Apostles constantly refer to the Scriptures, showing beyond doubt that they believed and taught that what the sacred writers said the Holy Ghost said. This proof bears especially on the writings of the Old Testament. But no Christian puts the inspiration of the Old Testament above that of the New. The evidence is directly the other way. If the Scriptures of the old economy were given by inspiration of God, much more were those writings which were penned under the dispensation of the Spirit. Besides, the inspiration of the Apostles is proved, (1) From the fact that Christ promised them the Holy Spirit, who should bring all things to their remembrance, and render them infallible in teaching. "It is not you," He said, "that speak, but the Spirit of my Father speaketh in you." "He that heareth you heareth me." He forbade them to enter upon their office as teachers until they were endued with power from on high. (2) This promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit descended upon the Apostles as a mighty rushing wind, and they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance. From this moment they were new men, with new views, with new spirit, and with new power and authority. The change was sudden. It was not a development. It was something supernatural; as when God said, Let there be light, and there was light. Nothing can be more unreasonable than to ascribe this sudden transformation of the Apostles from narrow-minded, bigoted Jews, into enlightened, large-minded Christians, to mere natural causes. Their Jewish prejudices had resisted all the instructions and influence of Christ for three years, but gave way in a moment when the Spirit came upon them from on high. (3) After the day of Pentecost the Apostles claimed to be the infallible organs of God in all their teachings. They required men to receive what they

taught not of the word of man, but of the word of God (I. Thess. 2:13); they declared, as Paul does (I. Cor. 14:37), that the things which they wrote were the commandments of the Lord. They made the salvation of men to depend on faith in the doctrines which they taught. Paul pronounced a curse even on an angel from heaven who should teach any other gospel than that which he had taught. (Gal.1:8) John says that whoever did not receive the testimony which he bore concerning Christ, made God a liar, because John's testimony was God's testimony. (I. John 5:10) "He that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us." (I John 4:6) This assertion of infallibility, this claim for the divine authority of their teaching, is characteristic of the whole Bible. The sacred writers all, and everywhere, claim personal authority; they never rest the obligation to faith in their teachings, on their own knowledge or wisdom. They speak as messengers, as witnesses, as oracles. They declare that what they said God said, and, therefore, on his authority it was to be received and obeyed. In I. Cor. 2:7-15, Paul sets forth this whole subject in the clearest and most concise manner. The things which he taught, which he calls "the wisdom of God," "the things of the Spirit," that is the gospel, the system of doctrine taught in the Bible, he says, had never entered into the mind of man. God had revealed these truths by His spirit; for the spirit is the only competent source of such knowledge. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so, the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." These things of the Spirit, Paul says, then proceeded, we teach "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth; but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," ~~combining~~ comparing spiritual with spiritual, i. e., clothing the truths of the Spirit in the words of the Spirit. There is neither in the Bible nor in the writings of men, a single or clearer statement of the doctrines of revelation and inspiration than that given by Paul. Revelation is the act of communicating divine knowledge by the Spirit to the mind. Inspiration is the act of the same kind, controlling those who make the truth known to others.

Who, then, is the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

that great stumbling-block, to some, that Jonah was three days in the whale's belly, are referred to by our Lord and His apostles with the sublime simplicity and confidence with which they are received by little children. (5) It lies in the very idea of the Bible, that God chose some men to write history; some to indite Psalms; some to teach doctrine; some to unfold the future. All were equally His organs, and each was infallible in his own sphere.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures Extends to the Words.

1. This again is included in the infallibility which our Lord ascribes to the Scriptures. A mere human record of a divine revelation must of necessity be not only fallible, but more or less erroneous.

2. The thoughts are in the words. The two are inseparable. If the words priest, sacrifice, ransom, expiation, propitiation, purification by blood, etc., etc. have no divine authority, then the doctrine which they embody has no divine authority.

3. Christ and His Apostles argue from the very words of the Scripture. Our Lord says that David by the Spirit called the Messiah Lord, that is David used that word. It was in the use of a particular word that Christ said (John 10:35) that the Scripture cannot be broken. "If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken," etc. The use of that word, therefore, according to Christ's view of the Scripture, was determined by the Spirit of God. Paul, in Gal. 3:16, lays stress on the fact, that in the promise made to Abraham, a word used is singular and not plural, "seed," as of one, and not "seeds" as of many. Constantly it is the very words of Scripture which are quoted as of divine authority.

4. The very form in which the doctrine of inspiration is taught in the Bible, assumes that the organs of God in the communication of His will were controlled by Him in the words which they used. "I have put my words in thy mouth." (Jer. 1:9) "It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (Matt. 10:20) They spake "as the Spirit gave

them utterance." (Acts 2:4) "Holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1:21) These and similar modes of expression with which the Scriptures abound imply that the words uttered were the words of God. This, moreover, is the very idea of inspiration as understood anciently. The words of the oracle were assumed to be the words of the divinity, and not those selected by the organ of communication. And this, too, as we have shown, was the idea attached to the gift of prophecy. The words of the prophet were the words of God, or he could not be God's spokesman and mouth. In the most formally didactic passage in the whole Bible on this subject (I. Cor. 2:10-13), the Apostle expressly asserts that the truths revealed by the spirit, be communicated in words taught by the Spirit.

PLENARY INSPIRATION.

The view we have given is known as the doctrine of plenary (Full) inspiration. That every word was suggested to the sacred writers by the Holy Spirit, and that they did nothing but write. This is also called by some theologians verbal inspiration. As believers we deny that inspiration is confined to parts of the Bible, but affirm that it applies to all the books of the sacred canon, and that all the sacred writers were fully inspired as to all that they teach, whether of doctrine or fact. This does not imply that the sacred writers were infallible except for the special purpose for which they were employed. They were not imbued with plenary knowledge as to all matters of science, philosophy, and history, but stood on the same level with their contemporaries. They were infallible only as teachers, and when acting as the spokesmen of God. Their inspiration did not make them geologists or astronomers. Isaiah was infallible in his predictions, although he shared with his countrymen the views then prevalent as to the mechanism of the universe.

Nor does this view imply that the sacred writers were free from errors in conduct. Their infallibility did not arise from their holiness, nor did inspiration render them holy. Balaam was inspired. Saul was among

the prophets. David was inspired to write psalms. The divine influence which preserved them from mistakes in teaching was not held back to preserve them from mistakes in conduct.

After all Christ is the main object of the Christian's faith. We believe Him and we believe everything else on His authority. He bears up the Old Testament and tells us that it is the Word of God; that its writers were led by the spirit; that the Scriptures cannot be broken. And we believe on His testimony. His testimony to His apostles is no less explicit, although given in a different way. He promised to give them a mouth and a wisdom which their adversaries could not gainsay or resist. He told them to take no thought what they should say, "For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." (Luke 12:12) "It is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (Matt. 10:20) He said to them "He that receiveth you receiveth me;" and He prayed for those who should believe on Him through their word. We believe the Scriptures, therefore, because Christ declared them to be the Word of God. Heaven and earth may pass away, but His word cannot pass away.

Objections to the views above stated are extant.

1. Some admit that some parts of the Scriptures are inspired, but contend that other parts are not. They claim that the Law and the Prophets only are inspired.

2. Another form of the doctrine of partial, as opposed to plenary inspiration, limits it to the thoughts, as distinguished from the words of Scripture. Verbal inspiration is denied. It is assumed that the sacred writers selected the words they used without the guidance of the spirit, to prevent their adopting improper or inadequate terms in which to express their thoughts.

3. A third form of the doctrine of partial inspiration was introduced in the twelfth century by Maimonides. He placed the inspiration of the Law much above that of the Prophets; and that of the Prophets higher than

that of the Hagiographa. The idea was that the writers of Kings and Chronicles need less, and that they received less divine assistance than Isaiah or John.

4. There are those who differ from all these views. They receive the Scriptures and hold that the Holy Spirit renews, guides, illuminates, sanctifies, and teaches all the people of God; and who regard inspiration to be one of the ordinary fruits of the Spirit. The sacred writers were, according to this view, merely holy men under the guidance of the ordinary influence of the Spirit. This theory extends to revelation as well as to inspiration. Some of these deny that the sacred writers in communicating the truths of the Bible were under any influence not common to ordinary believers.

That these objections to the doctrine of plenary inspiration are anti-scriptural is obvious:-

1. Because the Bible makes a marked distinction between those whom God chose to be His messengers, His prophets, His spokesmen, and other men. These objections ignore that distinction, so far as the people of God is concerned.

2. They are inconsistent with the authority claimed by the special messengers of God. They spoke in His name. God spoke though them. They said, "Thus saith the Lord," in a sense and way in which no ordinary believer dare use those words. This claim of the Prophets and Apostles to divine authority in teaching was confirmed by God himself in signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.

3. Because they are inconsistent with the whole nature of the Bible, which is and professes to be a revelation of truths not only undiscoverable by human reason, but which no amount of holiness could enable the mind of man to perceive. This is true not only of the strictly prophetic revelations relating to the future, but also of all things concerning the mind and will of God. The doctrines of the Bible are called "things concealed, unknown and unknowable, except as revealed to the Inspired Apostles and prophets by the

Spirit. (Heb. 3:5)

4. Because they are inconsistent with the faith of the church universal, which has always made the broadest distinction between the writings of the Apostles and Prophets and those of ordinary men. Even commentators with all their reverence for the fathers never presume to place their writings on a level with the Scriptures. They do not attribute to them divine authority, but as witnesses of what the Apostles taught. After all the question is not an open one. It is not what theory is most plausible, but simply, what does the Bible teach on the subject? If our Lord and His Apostles declare the Old Testament to be the Word of God; that what they said, the Spirit said; if they refer to the facts and to the very words of Scripture as of divine authority; and if the same infallible, divine guidance was promised to the writers of the New Testament, and claimed by themselves; and if their claim was authenticated by God himself; then there is no room for, as there is no need of, these theories of partial inspiration. The whole Bible was written under such an influence as preserved its human authors from all error, and makes it for His church the infallible rule of faith and practice.

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. Its Completeness. By this we mean that it contains all the extant revelations of God designed to be the rule of faith and practice in the church. It is not denied that God reveals himself, even His eternal power and Godhead, by His works, and has done so from the beginning of the world. But all the truths thus revealed are clearly made known in His written word. Nor is it denied that there may have been, and probably were, books written by inspired men, which are no longer in existence. Much less is it denied that Christ and His Apostles delivered many discourses which were not recorded, and which, could they now be known and authenticated, would be of equal authority with the books now regarded as canonical. All that Protestants insist upon is, that the Bible contains all the extant revelations of God, which He designed to be the rule of faith and practice for His church; so that nothing can be rightfully imposed on the consciences of men as truth or duty which is not taught directly or by necessary implication in the Holy Scriptures. This excludes all unwritten traditions, not only, but also all decrees of the visible church; all resolutions of conventions, or other public bodies, declaring this or that true or false, right or wrong. The people of God are bound by nothing but the Word of God. On this subject little need be said. The completeness of Scripture, as a rule of faith, is a corollary of the Protestant doctrine concerning tradition. If that be true, the former must be true also. This the Romanists do not deny. They make the rule offaith to consist of the written and the unwritten word of God, that is of Scripture and traditon. If it be proven that tradition is untrustworthy, human, and fallible, then the Scriptures by common consent stand alone in their authority.

Protestants object to tradition as a part of the rule of faith, because it is not adapted to that purpose. A rule of faith for the people must be something which they can apply; a standard by which they can [illegible]

But tradition is, of course, unwritten, and if any part be written, it is not contained in any one volume accessible to the people, and intelligible by them. It is scattered through the ecclesiastical records of eighteen centuries. It is absolutely impossible for the people to learn what it teaches. How can they tell whether the church in all ages has taught the doctrine of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, or any other popish doctrine. They are required to believe on the peril of their souls, doctrines, the pretended evidence of which it is impossible for them to ascertain or appreciate. Making tradition a part of the rule of faith and explanatory of the Bible subverts the authority of the Scriptures. This follows as a natural and unavoidable consequence. If there be two standards of doctrine of equal authority, the one explanatory, and an infallible interpreter of the other, as Romanists teach, it is of necessity the interpretation which determines the faith of the people. Instead, therefore, of our faith resting on the testimony of God as recorded in His Word, it rests on what poor, fallible, often fanciful, prejudiced, benighted men tell us is the meaning of the Bible. Man and his authority take the place of God. As this is the logical consequence of making tradition a rule of faith, so it is an historical fact that the Scriptures have been made of no account wherever the authority of tradition has been admitted. Our Lord said, that the Scribes and Pharisees made the Word of God of no effect by their traditions; (Matt. 15:6); Mark 7:13) that they taught for doctrines the commandments of men. This is no less historically true of the church of Rome. A great mass of doctrines, rites, ordinances, and institutions of which the Scriptures say nothing have been imposed on the reason, conscience, and life of the people. The Roman Catholic religion of our day, with its hierarchy, ritual, image and saint worship; with its absolutions, indulgences, and its despotic power over the conscience and life of the individual, is as little like the religion of the New Testament, as the present religion of the Hindus with its myriad of deities, its [illegible], and its

abominations, is like the simple religion of their ancient Vedas. In both cases similar causes have produced similar effects. In both there has been a provision for giving divine authority to the rapidly accumulating errors and corruptions of succeeding ages.

Tradition teaches error, and therefore cannot be divinely controlled so as to be a rule of faith. The issue is between Scripture and tradition. Both cannot be true. The one contradicts the other. One or the other must be given up. Of this at least no Protestant has any doubt. All the doctrines peculiar to Romanism, Protestants believe to be anti-Scriptural; and, therefore, they need no other evidence to prove that tradition is not to be trusted either in matters of faith or practice.

It is not by Romanists only that the completeness of the Scriptures is denied, practically at least, if not theoretically. Nothing is more common among Protestants, especially in our day, than the attempt to coerce the conscience of men by public opinion; to make the opinions of men on questions of morals a rule of duty for the people, and even for the church. If we would stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, we must adhere to the principle that in matters of religion and of morals the Scriptures alone have authority to bind the conscience.

2. <u>The Right of Private Judgment.</u> - The Bible is a plain book. It is intelligible by the people. And they have the right, and are bound to read and to interpret it for themselves: so that their faith may rest on the testimony of the Scriptures, and not on that of a priest, or the church. Such is the doctrine of Protestants on this subject.

It is not denied that the Scriptures contain many things hard to understand; that they require diligent study, that all men need the guidance of the Holy Spirit in order to right to right knowledge and true faith. But it is maintained that in all things necessary to salvation they are sufficiently plain to be understood even by the unlearned.

It is not denied that the people, learned and unlearned, in order to the proper understanding of the Scriptures, should not only [illegible]

Scripture with Scripture, and avail themselves of all the [illegible] power to aid them in their search after the truth, but they should also pay the greatest deference to the faith of the church. If the Scriptures be a plain book, and the Spirit performs the function of a teacher to all the children of God, it follows inevitably that they must agree in all essential matters in their interpretation of the Bible. And from that fact it follows that for an individual Christian to dissent from the faith of the universal church, that is the body of true believers, is tantamount to dissent from the Scriptures themselves.

What we deny on this subject is, that Christ has appointed any officer, or class of officers, in His church to whose interpretation of the Scriptures the people are bound to submit as of final authority. What we affirm is that Christ has made it obligatory upon every believer to search the Scriptures for himself, and determine on his own discretion what they require him to believe and to do.

The most obvious reasons in support of the right of private judgment are:-

(1) That the obligations to faith and obedience are personal. Every man is responsible for his religious faith and his moral conduct. (Rom.14:12) He cannot transfer that responsibility to others; nor can others assume it in his stead. He must answer for himself: and if he must answer for himself, he must judge for himself. It will not avail him in the day of judgment to say that another person, a priest, or his church taught him wrong. He should have listened to God and obeyed Him rather than men.

(2) The Scriptures are everywhere addressed to the people, and not to the officers of the church either exclusively, or specially. The prophets were sent to the people, and constantly said, "Hear, O Israel," "Hearken, O ye people." Thus, also, the discourses of Christ were addressed to the people, and the people heard Him gladly. All the Epistles of the New Testament are addressed to the congregation, or to individuals, to the

"called of Jesus Christ;" "to the beloved of God" to those "called to be saints;" "to the sanctified in Christ Jesus;" "to all who call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord;" "to the saints which are at (Ephesus), and to the faithful in Jesus Christ;" "to the saints and faithful brethren which are in (Colosse);" or to individuals as to Timothy, Titus, etc. It is the people who are addressed. To them are directed these profound discussions of christian doctrine and these comprehensive expositions of christian duty. They are everywhere assumed to be competent to understand what is written, and are everywhere required to believe and obey what thus came from the inspired messengers of Christ. They were not referred to any other authority, priest, or council, from which they were to learn the true import of these inspired instructions. It is, therefore, not only to deprive the people of a divine right, to forbid the people to read and interpret the Scriptures for themselves; but it is also to interpose between them and God, and to prevent their hearing His voice, that they may listen to the words of men.

(3) The Scriptures are not only addressed to the people, but the people are commanded to study them, and to teach them to their children. It was one of the most frequently recurring injunctions to parents under the old dispensation, to teach the law unto their children, that they again might teach it unto theirs. The "holy oracles" were committed to the people, to be taught by the people; and taught immediately out of the Scriptures, that the truth might be retained in its purity. Thus our Lord commanded the people to search the Scriptures, saying, "They are they which testify of me." (John 5:39.) He assumed that the people were able to understand what the Old Testament said of the Messiah, although its teachings had been misunderstood by the scribes and elders, and by the whole priesthood. Paul reminded that Timothy had from his youth known the Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation. Paul said in the Galatians (1:8-9), "Though we, or an angel from heaven, -- if any preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." This implies two things, - first, that the Galatian christians, the people, had a right

[illegible] and [illegible], that [illegible] to be determined, [illegible] of [illegible], then, the Bible [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible], they [illegible] of [illegible] of [illegible] and priests. [illegible] precisely that long before given by God to Moses (Deut. 13:1-3), who tells the people that if a prophet should arise, although he worked [illegible], they were not to believe or obey him, if he taught them anything contrary to the Word of God. This again assumes that the people had the ability and the right to judge, and they had an infallible rule of judgment. It implies, moreover, that their salvation depended upon their judging rightly. For, if they allowed these false teachers, though robed in sacred vestments, and surrounded by the insignia of authority, to lead them from the truth, they would inevitably perish.

(4) The right of private judgment is the great safeguard of civil and religious liberty. If the Bible be admitted to be the infallible rule of faith and practice in accordance with which men are bound on the peril of their souls, to frame their creed and conduct; and if there be a set of men who have the exclusive right of interpreting the Scripture, and who are authorized to impose their interpretations on the people as of divine authority, then they may impose on the people that conditions of salvation they see fit. And the men who have the salvation of the people in their hands are their absolute masters. Bath, reason and experience fully [illegible] the declaration of Chillingworth, when he says, "[illegible] will [illegible] absolute lordship and tyrannic over any people, need not [illegible] the trouble and difficulty of abrogation and disannulling the laws, [illegible] to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their interest and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and the authority [illegible] pleases, and all to them [illegible] interpretation

[illegible] and addition about the [illegible] of his [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

from their own intrinsic truth and [illegible].

(2) The words of Scripture are to be taken in their grammatical-historical sense. That is, there must be taken in the same sense attached to them in the age and by the people to whom they are addressed. This rule assumes that the sacred writers were honest, and meant to be understood.

(3) If the Scriptures be what they claim to be, the word of God, they are the product of one mind, and that mind divine. Upon this it follows that Scripture cannot contradict Scripture. God cannot teach in one place anything which is inconsistent with what He teaches in another. Hence Scripture must explain Scripture. If a passage admits of different interpretations, that only can be the true one which agrees with what the Bible teaches elsewhere on the same subject. If the Scriptures teach that the Son is the same in substance and equal in power and glory with the Father, then when the Son says, "The Father is greater than I," the superiority must be understood in a manner consistent with this equality. It must refer either to subordination as to the mode of subsistence and operation, or it must be official. A king's son may say, "My father is greater than I," although personally his father's equal. This rule of interpretation is sometimes called the analogy of Scripture, and sometimes the analogy of faith. There is no material difference in the meaning of the two expressions.

(5) The Scriptures are to be interpreted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which guidance is to be humbly and earnestly sought. The ground of this rule is two-fold. First, the Spirit is promised as a guide and teacher. He was to come to lead the people of God into the knowledge of the truth. And secondly, the Scriptures teach, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (I Cor.2-14) The unrenewed mind is naturally blind to spiritual truth. The heart is in opposition to the things of God. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." Congeniality of mind is necessary to the proper apprehension of

divine things. As only those who have a moral nature can discern moral truth, so those only who are spiritually minded can truly receive the things of the spirit. Our Lord manifests himself to all who love and obey Him. (John 14:21)

The fact that all the true people of God in every age and in every part of the Church, in the exercise of their private judgment, in association with the simple rules above stated, agree as to the meaning of scripture in all things necessary either in faith or practice, is a conclusive proof of the perspicuity of the Bible, and of the safety of allowing the people the enjoyment of the divine right of private judgment in all matters pertaining to religion.

CHAPTER VII.

Section 1.

THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

No language can adequately express or describe the nature or attributes of the Divine Being. We must turn to the revelation which He has made of Himself. "There is but one living and true God." This unity of the Divine Being is distinctly taught in the Scripture. Deut. 4:35-39; II Sam. 7:22; I. Kings 8:60; II. Kings 19:19; I. Chron. 17:20; Psalm 86:10; Isa. 45:10-11; Mark 12:29-32; John 17:3; I. Cor. 8:4; Eph. 4:6.

The Attributes of God are the qualities or perfections of His nature, which belong to, or are justly conceived of as existing in Him. The Divine Attributes belong to God, not as though they made up His nature, as though His whole being consisted only of the combination of the same, but because they are the forms and outward expressions in which His Being is revealed and becomes manifest.

The Divine attributes are usually divided into natural and moral.

The natural are those which belong to His existence as an infinite and rational spirit, viz: Self-existence (or eternity), Freedom, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Wisdom.

The moral attributes are Holiness, Righteousness (or Justice); Goodness, Love, Grace, (or Mercy) and Truth.

1. The uniform teaching of the Scripture is, that God is a Spirit (John 4:24). He is "the invisible God" (Col. 1:15; I Tim. 1:17), "whom no man hath seen, nor can see." (I. Tim. 6:16.)

2. God is an eternal Spirit, self-existent (Gen. 21:33). "I am" (Exod. 3:14; Deut. 33:27; Psalm 90:2; Isa. 40:28; Rom. 16:26; Rev. 4:8-11). Created intelligences are endowed with immortality. God alone possesses eternity.

3. God is infinite, filling all space (Jer. 23:24); the world of the universe, but not as part of it. Infinite in the perfection of all His

attributes (2 Chron. 6:18; Job 11:7-9; Psalm 147:5; Isa. 40:28; Rom. 11:33-

4. God is Omnipotent, i. e., infinite in power (Gen. 17:1; Rev. 19:6; Rom. 10:14; Job 42:2; Jer. 32:17; Matt. 19:26; Luke 18:27).

(a) God's omnipotence is shown in creation which is described as His act, done by the exercise of His volition (Heb. 1:1; Prov. 28:11; 2 Kings 17:15; Neh. 9:6; Psalm 33:6,9; Isa. 57:16; Jer. 10:12; Amos 4:13; Acts 14:15; I. Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16; Rev. 4:11).

(b) God's omnipotence is shown in the variety, universality, and multitude of His works. (Gen. 2:1-4; Job 9:5-10; Psalm 19:1; Psalm 104:2-7; Isa. 40:26; Isa. 42:5; Jer. 10:13; Rom. 1:20; Col. 1:16; Also by the descriptions of His power (Job 38:9-11; Psalm 18:9-15; Psalm 104:28-32; Heb. 5:3-1

(c) God's omnipotence is exercised over animate as well as inani creation; but its exercise is limited by His moral perfections. As a good cannot do a bad act, though he may have the opportunity, and the mental and physical power to do it, much less can God, though He is infinite in power, exercise it in doing wrong. His almightiness is moral as well as natural, and is always controlled by infinite Holiness, Justice, and Love.

5. God is omnipresent (I. Kings 8:27; Job 26:24; Psalm 33:13-14; Psalm 139:7-12; Jer. 23:23-24; Amos 9:2-5; Acts 17:27-28). If God be the Creator, Upholder, and Governor of all things, the idea of ubiquity is necessarily implied. His knowledge is His essence knowing; His actions are His essence acting; but as His knowledge and power are infinite, they, therefore reach all duration and space, and embrace all actions and events.

6. God is Omniscient. The texts which prove the omnipresence, for the most part, prove also the omniscience of God; See also I. Kings 8:5 Job 31:4; Job 34:21-22; Psalm 11:4; Psalm 94:9-11; Psalm 139; Prov. 15:3; Isa. 40:28; Jer. 32:19; Dan. 2:20-22; Heb. 4;13.

(a) God's intelligence is independent, i. e., it is not dependent upon His creatures or their actions, but upon His own infinite intuition of all things possible or actual, past, present, or future (I. Sam. 23:10-12; Isa. 46:9-10; Acts 1:24; Acts 15:18.)

(b) God's intelligence is perfect and absolute, i. e., He knows all things directly in their essences, which are often hidden from us, while we know they only in their properties, and as they [illegible] our senses.

(c) The foreknowledge of God is proven by the predictions which He inspires the prophets to utter; and it follows also from the perfection of His nature. How the foreknowledge of God is to be reconciled with man's free agency and moral accountability, is one of the most awful and dark problems of theology; indeed, it may be pronounced to be insoluble by human reason. But both these doctrines are clearly stated in Scripture, and are established by abundant evidence. We must, therefore, accept them "as of faith," though we may not be able to reconcile them.

In order to meet this difficulty, (1) Man's moral freedom has been denied by some; (2) Others have maintained that God, being infinitely free, abstains voluntarily from knowing what His creatures endowed with free agency will do; (3) Others, again, contend for a middle knowledge ("scientia media", i. e., foreknowledge as to what free agents will voluntarily do under given circumstances. None of these views are satisfactory. The first is opposed to Scripture, reason, and experience. The second is based upon a misconception, as though the omniscience of God were like His omnipotence; whereas, in fact, the former is a necessity of His nature; whereas, the latter is His power in operation, and implies that it may or may not be exercised as His will and wisdom may determine. The third is true, but defective; since this "middle knowledge" is necessarily implied in omniscience, as the less is included in the greater.

(d) The prescience or foreknowledge of God does not in any course of conduct upon an intelligent free agent; it in no degree effects his liberty of action. Man neither sins, nor follows holiness, as the result of God's foreknowledge; so that arguments used to prove that God's foreknowledge of Adam's fall and its consequences is inconsistent with, and opposed to, His goodness and justice are without foundation.

7. God is infinitely wise. God must know what is best, and must, therefore, be conceived of as always adopting the means which will best accomplish His purposes; and that constitutes wisdom. (a) God's wisdom is manifested in the adaptation of means to the end, as seen in creation (Job 26:1-14; Job 37:5-22; Psalm 104:24; Prov. 3:19-20; Isa. 40:12-15; Jer. 10:12-13); in Providence (Job 5:9-16; Job 37:12-14; Psalm 33:8-19; Psalm 113:5-9; Isa. 44:24-28; Dan. 2:20-22). God's wisdom is exhibited in the variety, beauty, order, and wondrous arrangements of nature; in the adaptation of man to the world and the world to man; of light to the eye, and the eye to light, etc. (b) God's wisdom is pre-eminently demonstrated in the plan of human salvation, by which the problem is solved as to how God can be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus (I. Cor. 1:24; Eph. 1:7-9; Eph. 3:9-11).

8. The perfect goodness of God is a glorious characteristic of His nature and is one of His moral attributes. It is shown in the benevolence which embraces all mankind, and provides for their welfare. It is exhibited in the mercy which the Divine Being shows towards His fallen creatures, and in the provision He has made for their relief and restoration to Himself. It is manifested in the grace which He gives to His creatures, which enables them to avail themselves of His merciful provision for their salvation, and to live so as to please Him (Exod. 34:6; Numb. 14:18; Psalm 25:7-8; Psalm 100:5; Psalm 119:78; Mah. 1:7; Matt. 19:17).

How the existence of moral evil can be consistent with the infinite goodness of God is a difficult question of a serious character, the complete solution of which is impossible to man. But sin does exist; and if God be the infinitely perfect Being which He is represented to be, it must follow that the permission of sin, and all its terrible consequences, is consistent with His holiness and goodness.

9. God is infinitely Holy in His nature and in His relations to man (Psalm 71:22; Psalm 111:9; Isa. 6:3; Hab. 1:13; I. Peter 1:16; Rev. 4:8; Rev. 15:4).

10. Justice or righteousness is a Divine perfection. It is holiness exhibited in government, and has been defined as its Legislative, Executive, and Judicial or Administrative (Exod. 34:7; Numb. 14:18; Deut. 32:4; Deut. 17:7; Psalm 89:14; Psalm 97:2; Jer. 33:19; Zeph. 3:5; I. Peter 1:17).

11. The Truth or Faithfulness of God is akin to His holiness and justice. His truth implies that all He says and does is true. It includes His veracity, "He cannot lie."

The unchangeableness of His laws, promises, and threatenings, results from His truth. His faithfulness to all His promises manifests His truth. Nor does the apparent failure of some promises or threatenings argue against this; for these are not always absolute, but more frequently conditional, either expressed or implied (Jonah 3:4-10). Language is sometimes used which seems to show that God changes His mind and action. This, however, is far from being any evidence of vacillation or changeableness. It, in fact, illustrative of His truth and unchangeableness. It is the alteration in man's conduct and feelings towards God which causes the change in His feelings and actions towards man. To be insensible to repentance and confession of wrong-doing, when united with a change of conduct on man's part, would be to represent God as a tyrant and monster. Nor is it possible to represent God's mercy and compassion in such cases other than in language such as is used in Scripture, although that language is necessarily defective (Gen. 6:6; Deut. 32:14; I. Sam. 15:35; II. Sam. 24:16; Psalm 106:45; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2).

12. Scripture assumes the existence of God, and never attempts to prove it; but in revealing Him it distinctly declares His Unity. It is impossible to define the Unity of God; the word unity in human language gives but a faint idea of it, barely serving to defend the doctrine against the opposite error.

The Unity of God is made the basis of worship, and the ground of obedience (Deut. 6:14; Deut. 6:4-5-15; Deut. 16:20; II. Kings 17:36; Matt. 4:10). The Unity of the Divine existence is [illegible]

against Polytheism and Duality (Exod. 20:3; I. Cor. 7:5; Isa. 40:8; Isa. 44:6-8; I. Cor. 8:4). The Divine Unity is also a [illegible] (Ps. 94:7-11).

But the Scriptures reveal a plurality of persons in the Unity of the Godhead. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost (Matt. 3:16-17; Matt. 28:19; John 14:16-17-26; John 15:26; II. Cor. 13:14; Eph. 2:18; Heb. 9:14).

Section 2.

THE TRINITY.

1. The doctrine of the Trinity is peculiar to the religion of the Bible. The design of all the revelations contained in the Word of God is the salvation of men. Truth is in order to holiness. God does not make known His being and attributes to teach men science, but to bring them to the saving knowledge of Himself. The doctrines of the Bible are, therefore, intimately connected with religion, or the life of God in the soul. They determine the religious experience of believers, and are presupposed in that experience. This is specially true of the doctrine of the Trinity. It is a great mistake to regard that doctrine as a mere speculative or abstract truth, concerning the constitution of the Godhead, with which we have no practical concern, or which we are required to believe simply because it is revealed. On the contrary, it underlies the whole plan of salvation, and determines the character of the religion (in the subjective sense of that word) of all true christians. It is the unconscious, or unformed faith, even of those of God's people who are unable to understand the term by which it is expressed. They all believe in God, the Creator and Preserver against whom they have sinned, whose justice they know they cannot satisfy, and whose image they cannot restore to their apostate nature. They, therefore, as a necessity, believe in a divine Redeemer and a divine Sanctifier. They have, as it were, the factors of the doctrine of the Trinity in their religious convictions. No mere speculative doctrine, especially no doctrine so mysterious and so out of analogy with all other objects of human [illegible] -

edge, as that of the Trinity, could ever have held the [illegible] the faith of the church, which this doctrine has maintained. It is not too much to say with Meyer, that "the Trinity is the point in which all Christian ideas and interests unite; at once the beginning and the end of all insight into Christianity." It is only the doctrine as presented in the Bible, which binds the faith and conscience of the people of God.

The form in which this doctrine lies in the Bible, and in which it enters into the faith of the church universal, includes substantially the following particulars:

1. There is one only living and true God, or Divine Being. The religion of the Bible stands opposed not only to Atheism, but to all forms of polytheism. The Scriptures everywhere assert that Jehovah alone is God. (Deut). "The Lord our God is one Lord." "I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God." (Isa. 44:6). "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well." (James 2:19). The Decalogue, which is the foundation of the moral and religious code of Christianity, as well as Judaism, has as its first and greatest commandment, "Thou shalt have no other God before me." No doctrine, therefore, can possibly be true which contradicts this primary truth of natural as well as of revealed religion.

2. In the Bible all divine titles and attributes are ascribed equally to the Father, Son, and Spirit. The same divine worship is rendered to them. The one is as much the object of adoration, love, confidence, and devotion as the other. It is not more evident that the Father is God, than that the Son is God; nor is the deity of the Father and Son more clearly revealed than that of the Spirit.

3. The terms Father, Son, and Spirit do not express different relations of God to His creatures. They are not analogous to the terms Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor, which do express such relations. The Scriptural facts are: ~~(a) The Father says Thou to the Son, and the Son says Thou to the Father; and in like manner the Father and the Son use the [illegible]~~

~~[illegible] He and Him in reference to the Spirit.~~ (c) The Father loves the Son; the Son loves the Father; the Spirit testifies of the Son. The Father, Son, and Spirit are severally subject and object. They act and are acted upon, or are the objects of action. Nothing is added to these facts when it is said that the Father, Son, and Spirit are distinct persons; for [illegible] an intelligent subject who can ~~say I~~, who can be addressed ~~as Thou~~, and who can act and can be the object of action. The summation of the above facts is expressed in the proposition, The one divine Being subsists in three persons, Father, Son, and Spirit. This proposition adds nothing to the facts themselves; for the facts are; (1) That there is one divine Being; (2) The Father, Son, and Spirit are divine. (3) The Father, Son, and Spirit are, in the sense just stated, distinct persons. (4) Attributes being inseparable from substance, the Scriptures, in saying that the Father, Son, and Spirit possess the same attributes, say they are the same in substance; and, if the same in substance, they are equal in power and glory.

4. Notwithstanding that the Father, Son, and Spirit are the same in substance, and equal in power and glory, it is no less true, according to the Scriptures, (a) That the Father is first, the Son second, and the Spirit third. (b) The Son is of the Father; and the Spirit is of the Father and of the Son. (c) The Father sends the Son, and the Father and Son send the Spirit. (d) The Father operates through the Son, and the Father and Son operate through the Spirit. The converse of these statements is never found. The Son is never said to send the Father, nor to operate through Him; nor is the Spirit ever said to send the Father, or the Son, or to operate through them. The facts contained in this paragraph are summed up in the proposition; In the Holy Trinity there is a subordination of the persons as to the mode of subsistence and operation. This proposition [illegible] nothing to the facts themselves.

5. According to the Scriptures, the Father created the world, the Son created the world, and the Spirit created the world. The Father preserves all things; the Son upholds all things; and the Spirit is the [illegible]

of all life. These facts are [illegible] Trinity [illegible] *ad Extra*. Nevertheless there are [illegible] acts which are predominantly referred to the Father, others to the Son, and others to the Spirit. The Father creates and calls; the Son redeems; and the Spirit sanctifies. And, on the other hand, there are certain acts, [illegible], predicated of one person of the Trinity, which are [illegible] of the others. Thus, generation belongs exclusively to the Father, filiation to the Son, and procession to the Spirit. This is the form in which the doctrine of the Trinity lies in the Bible. This statement involves no philosophical element. It is simply an arrangement of the clearly revealed facts bearing on this subject. This is the form in which the doctrine has always entered into the faith of the church, as a part of its [illegible] and experience.

To say that this doctrine is incomprehensible, is [illegible] more than must be admitted of any other great truth, whether of revelation, or of science. Our inability to comprehend this doctrine [illegible] that we are finite beings, and not God. It is a [illegible] and we believe the plain fact that God is Three in One. In the *manner* lies the mystery we have no concern with it. We believe just as much as God has revealed, and more. 'There are many things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.' Part of these God has revealed to us by the Spirit; 'revealed,' that is -- unveiled, uncovered; that part He requires us to believe. Part of them He has not revealed; that we need not, and indeed cannot, know; it is far above -- out of our sight. Now, where is the wisdom of rejecting what is revealed, because we do not understand what is not revealed -- of denying the *fact* [illegible] unveiled, because we cannot see the *manner*, which is still veiled.

It is a fact worthy of serious consideration that [illegible] Christian world agree here, however they may differ on other [illegible] -- the Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

of the Church of Christ hold the doctrine of the Trinity [illegible].

While this doctrine cannot be [illegible] of Scriptural passages, yet its constituent elements [illegible], some in one place, and some in another. The unity of the Divine Being; the true and equal divinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit; their distinct personality; the relation in which they stand one to the other, and to the Church and the world, are not presented in a doctrinal formula in the word of God, but the several constituent elements of the doctrine are asserted, or assumed, over and over, from the beginning to the end of the Bible. It is, therefore, by proving these elements separately, that the whole doctrine can be most satisfactorily established. All that is here necessary is a reference to the general teachings of Scripture on the subject, and to a few passages in which everything essential to the doctrine is included.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF OF THE DOCTRINE.

1. The progressive character of divine revelation is recognized in relation to all the great doctrines of the Bible. One of the strongest arguments for the divine origin of the Bible is the organic relation of its several parts. They comprise more than sixty books written by different men in different ages, and yet they form our whole; not by external historical relations, nor in virtue of the general identity of the subjects of which they treat, but by their internal organic development. All that is in a full-grown tree was potentially in the seed. All that we find unfolded in the fullness of the gospel lies in a rudimental form in the earliest books of the Bible. What at first is only obscurely intimated is gradually unfolded in subsequent parts of the sacred volume, until the truth is revealed in its fulness. This is true of the doctrine of redemption; of the person and [illegible] of the Messiah, the promised seed of the woman; of the nature and office of the Holy Spirit; and of a future state beyond the grave. [illegible] is specially true of the doctrine of the Trinity. [illegible]

[illegible] intimations of the doctrine which receive [illegible] later revelations. That the [illegible] of God [illegible] in the [illegible] personal pronouns are often in the first person plural ([illegible] our image"); that the form of benediction ([illegible]) is threefold, and other facts of like nature. Then, however, it becomes plain, from the progress of the revelation, that there are three persons in the Godhead. Thus such forms of expression can hardly fail to be recognized as having their foundation in that great truth.

2. Much more important, however, is the fact, that not only in Genesis, but also in all the early books of Scripture, we find a distinction made between Jehovah and the angel of Jehovah, who himself is God, to whom all divine titles are given, and divine worship is rendered. As the revelation is unfolded, such distinction becomes more and more manifest. This messenger of God is called the <u>word</u>, the <u>wisdom</u>, the Son of God. His personality and divinity are clearly revealed. He is of old, even from everlasting, the Mighty God, the Adonai, the Lord of David, Jehovah our Righteousness, who was to be born of a virgin, and bear the sins of many.

3. In like manner, even in the first chapter of Genesis, the Spirit of God is represented as the source of all intelligence, order, and life in the created universe; and in the following books of the Old Testament He is represented as inspiring the prophets, giving wisdom, strength, and goodness to statesmen and warriors, and to the people of God. This Spirit is not an agency, but an agent, who teaches and selects; who can be sinned against and grieved; and who, in the New Testament, is unmistakably revealed as a distinct person. When John the Baptist appeared, we find him speaking of the Holy Spirit as of a person with whom his countrymen were familiar, as an object of divine worship and the giver of saving blessings. Our divine Lord also takes this truth for granted, and promised to send the Spirit, as a Paraclete, to take His place; to instruct, comfort, and strengthen them; when they were to receive and obey. Thus, without any violent transition, the

earliest revelations of this mystery were gradually unfolded, until the Triune God, Father, Son, and Spirit, appears in the New Testament as the universally recognized God of all believers.

4. In the formulas of Baptism and of the Apostolic Benediction, provision was made to keep this doctrine constantly before the minds of the people, as a cardinal article of the Christian faith. Every Christian is baptised in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The personality, the divinity, and consequently the equality of these three subjects, are here taken for granted. The association of the Son and Spirit with the Father, the identity of relation, so far as dependence and obedience are concerned, which we sustain to the Father, Son, and Spirit respectively, the confession and profession involved in the ordinances of God's house, all forbid any other interpretation than that which it has always received in the church. If the expression, "In name of the Father," implies the personality of the Father, the same implication is involved when it is used in reference to the Son and Spirit. If we acknowledge our subjection and allegiance to the one, we acknowledge the same subjection and allegiance to the other divine persons here named.

In the Apostolic Benediction, a prayer is addressed to Christ for His grace, to the Father for His love, and to the Spirit for His fellowship. The personality and divinity of each one therefore solemnly recognized every time that this benediction is pronounced and received.

5. In the record of our Lord's baptism, the Father addresses the Son, and the Spirit descends in the form of a dove. In the discourse of Christ recorded in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of John's Gospel, our Lord speaks to and of the Father, and promises to send the Spirit to teach, guide, and comfort His disciples. In that discourse the personality and divinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit are recognized with equal clearness. In I. Cor. 12:4-6, the Apostle speaks of diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit; of diversity of administration, but the same Lord; and of diversities of operations, but the same God. The faith of the church in the doctrine of

Trinity does not rest mainly on such arguments as those above stated. The great foundation of that faith is what is taught everywhere in the Bible of the Unity of the Divine Being; of the personality and divinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit; and of their mutual relations.

REMARKS.

1. The philosophical statements of the doctrine of the Trinity have been intended by their authors either to prove it, or to illustrate it, or to explain it away and substitute some speculative theory as to the constitution of the universe for the scriptural doctrine of the Triune God. The two former of these classes, those designed for proof, and those designed for illustration, need not be discriminated. The most they can do is to show that in other spheres and in relation to other subjects, we find a somewhat analogous triplicity in unity. The fathers were accustomed to refer to the union of light, heat, and radiance in the same substance of the sun; to a fountain and its streams; to the root, stem, and flower of a plant; to the intellect, will, and affections in the soul: as examples of at least a certain kind of triplicity in unity elsewhere than in the Godhead. Augustine said, that as man was made in the image of the Triune God, we have reason to expect something in the constitution of our nature answering to the Trinity in the Godhead. He refers to the memory, intelligence, and will, as coexisting in one mind, so that the operations of the one are involved in the operations of the others. Gregory refers for his illustration to the soul, the reason, and the living power, united in one spiritual substance in man. It must be admitted that these analogies do not hold good as to one point, for these different powers in man are not different substances, but different modes of activity of one and the same personal essence, so that these two illustrations lead rather to the Sebellian, than to the scriptural view of the doctrine of the Trinity. By far the most common illustration was borrowed from the operations of our conscious [illegible]. [illegible] objective to ourselves, and are conscious of the identity of the [illegible]

object. We have thus the subjective [illegible], the objective [illegible], [illegible] of the [illegible]; the desired [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible]. [illegible] another, this illustration has come down from the fathers, through the [illegible]-men and reformers, to theologians of our day.

[illegible]

"Father of heaven, whose love profound
A ransom for our souls hath found,
Before thy throne we sinners bend;
To us thy pardoning love extend.
Almighty Son, Incarnate Word,
Our Prophet, Priest, Redeemer, Lord,
Before thy throne we sinners bend;
To us thy saving grace extend.

Eternal Spirit, by whose breath
The soul is raised from sin and death,
Before thy throne we sinners bend;
To us thy quick'ning power extend.

Jehovah! Father, Spirit, Son,
Mysterious Godhead! Three in One!
Before thy throne we sinners bend;
Grace, pardon, life, to us extend."

Edward Cooper.

[illegible] VIII.

[illegible]

The doctrine of redemption is [illegible] Bible. The person and work of the Redeemer is, therefore, the [illegible] of the sacred writers. From the nature of the work which He was to accomplish, it was necessary that He should be at once God and man. He must participate in the nature of those whom He came to redeem; and have power to subdue all evil, and dignity to give value to His obedience and sufferings. From the beginning to the end, therefore, of the Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, a Godman Redeemer is held up as the object of supreme reverence, love, and confidence to the perishing children of men. It is absolutely impossible to present a tithe of the evidence which the Scriptures contain of the truth of this doctrine. It is to the Bible what the soul is to the body -- its living and all-pervading principle, without which the Scriptures are a cold, lifeless system of history and moral precepts. It seems, therefore, to be a work of supererogation to prove to Christians the divinity of their Redeemer. It is like proving the sun to be the source of light and heat to the system of which it is the centre. Still as there are those who profess to be christians, who deny this doctrine, it is necessary that a part, at least, of the evidence by which this great truth is proven should be presented, and should be at command to resist the gainsayers.

The Deity of the Father is admitted by all believers. But the Deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit is not. Here we meet the heresies of the Arians, Socinians, and Unitarians. Arius maintained that the Son of God is creature, but the first and noblest of all created beings, and that the Holy Ghost was created by His power. The Council of Nice was held to [illegible] suppression, and the Nicene Creed was drawn up and adopted [illegible] against it.

Socinus and his followers denied the divinity of Christ with the sacrifice of His death; and [illegible]

personality and Godhead of the Spirit [illegible] exertion of divine power. [illegible] level with [illegible] and the [illegible] of Mohammed.

The Unitarians teach, (1) that Christ is not [illegible], but an exalted and pre-eminent pattern of human perfection; (2) [illegible] Scriptures are "not a revelation, but the record of a revelation;" (3) That the Sabbath or Lord's Day of Christians under the New Testament has no connection whatever with the ancient Jewish Sabbath; (4) That it is doubtful whether the soul is a substance or a principle separate from the body; (5) That there are no such spiritual beings as the devil, or evil angels; (6) That the Scriptures do not teach the doctrine of eternal punishments.

<u>That the Deity of the Son and the Holy Ghost is also explicitly revealed we will endeavor to show.</u>

1. Take the testimony of Christ Himself (John 7:15; John 6:32,33, 38,50,51,58,62; John 16:28). Inspired men,-- Of John the Baptist (John 3:31); of the Apostle John (John 1:1,3,14); of Paul (I. Cor. 15:47; Eph. 4:9; Heb. 2:14-16). All these Scriptures are perfectly plain if we regard Christ as having had an existence before He appeared among men. His birth at Bethlehem was not His beginning. It was His arrival from another sphere.

<u>HIS PRE-EXISTENCE.</u>

2. The Scriptures carry the mind backward, and yet farther backward, until the thoughts are lost in the inscrutable depths of a pre-eternity. (1) Christ existed before John the Baptist (John 1:15-27), though [illegible] His human conception, birth, or personal ministry. (2) He existed before Abraham (John 8:58). The question, to which this text was an answer, [illegible] to pre-existence, and in this sense the Jews took it. ( ) He existed before the flood (I. Pet. 3:18-20), for "He preached" to the [illegible] world; if, this were done by the ministry of a [illegible] (II. Pet. [illegible]); yet to do anything by another not able to perform it without, [illegible] His existence as if He did it of Himself. ( ) He existed before [illegible]

([illegible] 1:3; [illegible] 15th [illegible]; [illegible] 1:17; [illegible] 1:[illegible]). (3) [illegible] all eternity ([illegible]); [illegible] of [illegible] of this [illegible] in the [illegible] silences of [illegible]. [illegible], the pre-existence of Christ, [illegible], does not evince His Godhead, and is not, therefore, [illegible] hypothesis --that Christ was the first and greatest of creatures; but it destroys the Socinian and Unitarian hypothesis, that Christ was [illegible]. When we are carried back by the Scriptures to the [illegible] of eternity, and are told that "in the beginning" He was with God, yea, and "was God," then the doctrine of His pre-existence is a powerful argument in proof of His Divine nature. He must be God in all the mystery and all the majesty of that nature, if He could be spoken of in words like these.

5. Christ appeared as a Divine Person before His advent. It is clear that a Divine Person did appear, though often in the form of an angel, both to the patriarchs and to their successors:---To Abraham at Mamre (Gen. 18th Ch). Here He comes as one of "three men," but He announces Himself as "Jehovah," who can so overrule the processes of nature as to give the aged woman a son (ver. 14); and as they look towards Sodom, He stands forth as Deity confessed; six times He is called "Jehovah" (vers. 17, 19, 20, 22, 26, 33); once "the Judge of all the earth" (Ver. 25); such is His power, that He threatens to destroy the Cities of the Plain (Vers. 20,21); He receives the adoring worship of His servant (ver. 23); "then Jehovah went on His way" (Ver. 33). ---To Abraham at Moriah (Gen. 22). God came to try the faith of the patriarch. In ver. 11 we find that the "God" who tried him (ver. 1) was "the Angel of the Lord." It was to Him that the sacrifice would have been offered, and He declares that the readiness to offer the son of His affection to Him (the Angel) was proof that Abraham feared God (ver. 12). He then calls to him again, delivers the message of the eternal God, and by using the phrase, "By Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord" (ver. 16), He shows that there are distinctions of persons in the Godhead, and that He Himself, though Divine, was the medium of communication between heaven and

earth. --To Jacob at Bethel (Gen. 28:13-17). Here was a glorious [illegible] to Jacob of "Jehovah God of Abraham;" and in (Gen. 31:11-13), we find that it was "the Angel of the Lord" who as Jehovah thus appeared. --To Jacob at Peniel (Gen. 32). The patriarch was subjected to a strange and mysterious conflict with "a man" (ver. 24); but when the day came, "the Man" gave him a new name (vers. 28-30); and in both cases the statment was made that the Being with whom he wrestled was none other than "God" Himself, whom Hosea designates "the Angel" -- "the Lord God of Hosts" (Hosea 12:4-5). --To Moses at Horeb (Exod. 3). A burning bush startles the man of God, and a voice speaks; but the Speaker, "Angel" as He was (ver. 2), is called "Jehovah," "God" (ver. 4), "the God of Abraham," etc. (ver. 6), and the great "I AM" (ver. 14). He claims the tribes of Israel as His people (ver. 7) and promises that Himself should bring them out of Egypt to the Promised Land (ver. 17), which promise He afterwards fulfilled, when, as "Jehovah" (Exod. 13:21), "the Angel" (Exod. 14:19), He went before them in the cloudy and fiery pillar. Many other appearances of the same august Being are given. In Exod. 19, 20, 21 ch., He comes down on Mt. Sinai, and is called "Jehovah;" in Acts 7:38, He who thus came down is called "the Angel." In Exod. 23:20-21, He is promised as the Guide and Leader of the people to the Promised Land: and that He was the same Divine Angel is evident from the fact that He claims their obedience, that it is His prerogative to pardon or punish sin, and that God's own peculiar name, "Jehovah I AM," is in Him. With this uncreated Angel, -- this presence of the Lord, -- the people were satisfied (Exod. 33: 14-15); whereas, the thought of being left to the guidance of "an angel" -- a mere ministering spirit -- filled them with sadness and mourning (Exod. 33:2). In Joshua 5:13-15, He is called "a Man," because He assumes a human form; He is also called Captain of the "Lord's Host," and, therefore, distinct from Jehovah, whose host He led; still, He is called "Jehovah" (Josh. 6:2), whose presence made the ground holy.

4. It is clear that the Divine Person thus revealed was not and the

Father. [illegible] God the Father [illegible] that [illegible] time seen His [illegible], nor has He ever limited Himself [illegible] [illegible] appearance. [illegible] maintained the [illegible] "the invisible God," "whom no man hath seen nor can see" (I. Tim. 1:17; I. [illegible] John 5:37). Moreover, in no part of Scripture is [illegible] On this subject there is perfect uniformity in the language of the [illegible] writers. According to them, the Father sends the Son, and the Father and the Son send the Holy Spirit; but neither the Son, nor the Spirit, nor both united, ever send the Father.

5. It is also clear that this Divine Person was the promised and future Christ; for Christ is announced under the very same titles that the Angel bore. Malachi speaks of Him as "the Messenger" or "Angel of the covenant" (Mal. 3:1); but the same person who is the Messenger is the Lord Jehovah Himself; not the same person with the sender, but bearing the same name, because united in that mysterious nature and undivided substance which the name imports. The same person, therefore, is servant and Lord, and by uniting these characters in the same person, what does the prophet but describe that great mystery of the Gospel, the union of the Divine and the human nature in the person of the Christ? Observe, also, as a messenger or angel is the servant of Him who sends him, in evident reference to this, is called God's servant (Isa. 5[illegible]:13; Isa. 53:11; Isa. 49:6). A messenger is a service; it implies a person sending and a person sent; and as this name is given to the Lord Jesus, it appears that whenever God has had a commission to execute, that commission has been confined to His Son, who, from the beginning, has been the Mediator between God and man. "Who [illegible] [illegible] to be equal with God, but [illegible] the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:6-12). The identity of titles, both Divine and [illegible] -- titles of nature and of office, which were [illegible] the Lord Jesus, are, to our mind, [illegible] Observe, also, that various things, said to be done by the Angel Jehovah in

the [illegible] Testament, are [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] Jehovah [illegible] Moses [illegible] Mt. [illegible] [illegible] are told that it was "Jesus," the Mediator of the new covenant, [illegible] then shook the earth." (2) The Angel Jehovah, [illegible] Mt. Sinai," gave the law, and made the covenant, [illegible] called [illegible], with the children of Israel. Jeremiah tells us that the new covenant with Israel was to be made by the same person who made the Old (Jer. 31:31-34); and from Paul we learn that this new covenant, predicted by Jeremiah, is the Christian dispensation, and Christ is its author (Heb. 8:6-10). The Christ of the New Testament and the Angel Jehovah of the Old are, therefore, the same Person. (3) We have seen how the Angel Jehovah was the leader and guide of the Israelites to the Promised Land, and the New Testament frequently identifies the Lord Jesus with the events of their journey. The "reproach" which Moses endured, when he "refused to be called the Son of Pharoah's daughter" is called "the reproach of Christ" (Heb. 11:26). But how can this be true unless the people were the people of Christ, and so the reproach was His? They are charged with tempting the Lord their God in Massah (Deut. 6:16), which they did by murmuring and repining at what He, as their Divine Leader, allotted them to bear. But Paul tells us that it was Christ whom they tempted when they murmured against God in the wilderness (I. Cor. 10:9). But how can this be true, excepting as Christ was then with them as "the Lord their God," leading them to the land of [illegible]. They were supplied with [illegible] from heaven and water from the rock, [illegible] those spiritual supplies which supplied the life-giving stream [illegible] Christ [illegible] "followed them" (margin) "went with them" wherever they journeyed (I. Cor. 10:[illegible]). But how can this be true, unless Christ was with them, their [illegible]ing companion, the author of all their temporal blessings and [illegible] spiritual [illegible] which they enjoyed?

Thus, from the New Testament, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], was the Angel Jehovah of the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

C. Divine Titles are Given to Christ.

1. He is called God. [illegible] is considered God in the Bible when it cannot [illegible] that it is used in its [illegible] and interpretable sense. [illegible] (Isai. 7:14), and to mighty, wonderful, and [illegible] (Isai. 9:6; cp. 28:1-6), because of some [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible]. But it is in no sense or [illegible] sense that Christ is called God, (Jno. [illegible]; 2:28; John 1:1; John 20:28; Rom. 9:5; I. Tim. 3:16; [illegible] II. [illegible] 1:1). But, as it [illegible] out the meaning of original [illegible] source, He is called "the [illegible] God" (Jno. 9:5); "[illegible]" (Jno. [illegible]), "the true God" (I. John 5:20), "the great God" (Titus 2:13).

2. He is called Jehovah. The word "Jehovah" in the [illegible] Bible, when written [illegible], [illegible] Jehovah, which is [illegible] to be the [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] "[illegible] I am [illegible] to another." [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Jehovah in the Scriptures by [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

7. [illegible]

(1) [illegible] [illegible]; [illegible] 5:2; [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] with Rev. [illegible]; [illegible]; [illegible].

(2) Omnipotence. Matt. 10:20; Matt. 28:20; [illegible].

(3) Omniscience. John 2:24-25; [illegible]; [illegible]; [illegible], compared with I. Kings 8:39.

(4) Omnipotence. Isa. 9:6; Phil. 3:21; Rev. 1:8.

(5) Immutability. Heb. 1:10-12; Heb. 13:8.

(6) [illegible] attributes of the Father. John [illegible]; [illegible].

8. Divine [illegible] ascribed to Christ.

(1) The creation of the Universe. [illegible] written clearly, [illegible] the light of its own evidence [illegible], it is this: [illegible] creation ascribed to Christ. (John 1:3-10; [illegible]; Col. 1:16; [illegible]).

By thus ascribing the work of creation to the Son, [illegible] do not exclude the [illegible] of the Father and the [illegible] Christ. [illegible] break in upon the unity of the Godhead, [illegible] the [illegible] of the Deity, in distinguishing [illegible] the [illegible] God; but the [illegible] immediate and [illegible] the [illegible]-fold energy of the Divine nature.

(2) Providential Government. Matt. [illegible]; [illegible]; John 5:35; John 17:2; Acts 1:[illegible]; [illegible]; [illegible] 1:17; [illegible]; Rev. 17:14.

(3) The [illegible]. Matt. [illegible]; [illegible]; Col. [illegible]:15.

(4) The Final Dissolution and [illegible] [illegible]-13; Phil. 3:21; Rev. 21:5.

(5) The [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

9. Divine Worship is paid to Christ.

(1) [illegible] Rom. 10:12-13; [illegible] Acts 1:24; [illegible] II. [illegible] I. Thess. 3:11-13; II. Thess. 2:16-17.

(2) He is worshipped by angels. Heb. 1:6; Rev. 5:11-12.

(3) He is to be worshipped by every creature in the universe. Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:9-11; Rev. 5:13-14.

After reading such scriptures, can we doubt whether [illegible] is thus represented as occupying the same throne with the eternal Father, and receiving the very same expressions of adoration and praise, -- of unqualified adoration, of everlasting praise -- be himself and in the same sense, and in as high a sense, as the Father Himself is so styled.

10. The Solemn Declarations of Christ proved in Divinity. (Read Luke [illegible]:70; John 5:19-25; John 10:30; John 14:9; John 16:15.

If this be His testimony concerning Himself, we are reduced to the fearful alternative, either to recognize Him as destitute of the human excellences of sincerity, humility, and truth; unless, indeed, we have recourse to a supposition, upon which the most desperate of His modern opponents have not yet ventured, and say with His jealous kinsmen (Mark 3:31) that He was beside Himself. Of a truth, the alternative is terrible. But can devout and earnest thought falter for a moment in suspense? We must either believe Christ to be just what He tells us He is, or we must believe Him to be an imposter.

11. God was Manifest in the Flesh. (I. Tim. 3:16).

We have seen in this chapter that Jesus Christ is verily and truly God. Now we consider other scriptures that teach that Jesus Christ is verily and truly man. Eighty times Christ is called [illegible] Him to denote His proper humanity, [illegible]

[illegible] of the nature of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (John 14:9 [illegible]

[illegible] Invisible God [illegible] the soul, [illegible] is discovered by what it does through the body, so he [illegible] sees Him in the Son. (John 1:18) He incidentally assumes equal [illegible] with the Father by the use of the pronouns Ye and Ye, which it would be the height of presumption for a creature to use. (John 14:23; John 17:21-22).

Mediation. The union of two whole and perfect natures, Divinity and Humanity, qualify Jesus Christ to be the Mediator, that is, perfectly to represent God to sinful man and fallen man to God, and to provide, through His shed blood and the agency of the Holy Spirit, for a reconciliation between them. (I. Tim. 2:5; Heb. 8:6; Heb. 9:15; Heb. 12:24; Rev. 1[illegible]:8)

All the apostles and prophets abundantly teach that the Messiah is truly God as well as truly man. Violence must be done to the ordinary use and rules of language if this teaching is rejected or denied. [illegible] Titus 1:3; Titus 2:13; II. Tim. 1:10; II. Thess. [illegible], especially I. Tim. 3:16. Here we find (1) Christ is God. (2) He was manifest in the flesh, or became man. (3) He was justified, i. e., His claims to be [illegible] God manifest in the flesh were proven to be [illegible] by the Spirit (i. e. either by the Holy Ghost, or by the divine nature [illegible] in Him. Compare John 1:14) (4) He was seen of [illegible]. They recognized and [illegible] Him. (5) He was preached unto the Gentiles, [illegible] of all men, and not [illegible] (6) He was believed [illegible] and [illegible] (7) He was received up into [illegible] and intercedes. Imperfect and unsatisfactory [illegible] sufficient [illegible]

[illegible] VIII. (1)

[illegible]

The Third person of the Godhead is called "the Spirit," [illegible] eminence, probably, for the [illegible] reason. First, because He is the [illegible] efficiency of God, i. e., the power through [illegible] the efficient [illegible] directly exercised; and secondly, to express the relation of the [illegible] persons of the Trinity. As Father and Son are terms expressive of [illegible] it is natural to infer that the word Spirit is to be understood in the same way. The Son is called the Word, as the revealer or image of God, and the Third person is called Spirit as the (πνεῦμα) breath or breath. [illegible] also [illegible] called the "Holy Spirit," to indicate both His nature and operations. He is eternal like the Father, and the source of life in all creatures. Thus the term [illegible] is called the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Wisdom, of Peace, of Love, and of Power.

[illegible] OF THE [illegible]

I. Personality.

Before considering the direct proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit in a creed, it may be well to remark, that the terms "the Spirit," "the Spirit called," "the Holy Spirit," and other [illegible] [illegible] when God is spoken of, "His Spirit," occur in all parts of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. These and similar terms are [illegible] to be understood in the same sense throughout the Scriptures. [illegible] of God which proceed on the part of the Father, [illegible] the embodiment, which is not a [illegible], which [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the question arises, whether, besides these, there are not [illegible] portions of Scripture which do positively and unanswerably establish His personality.

The personality of the Holy Spirit has been the faith of the church universal from the beginning. Personality includes intelligence, will, and individual subsistence. If, therefore, it can be proved that all these are attributed to the Spirit, it is thereby proved that He is a person. It will not be necessary or advisable to separate the proofs of these several points, and cite passages which ascribe to Him intelligence, and others which attribute to Him will, and still others to prove His individual subsistence, because all these are often included in one and the same passage; and arguments which prove the one, in many cases prove also the others.

1. The first argument for the personality of the Holy Spirit is derived from the use of the personal pronouns in relation to Him. — [illegible] that which, when speaking, is called I; when spoken to, is called thou; and when spoken of, is called he, or [illegible]. It is admitted that [illegible] a rhetorical figure as personification; that inanimate things, [illegible] or attributes, may be introduced as speaking, or addressed as persons. But this creates no difficulty. The cases of personification are [illegible] except in rare instances, admit of no doubt. The fact that [illegible] as personification all the passages in which [illegible] a person. So also [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (John 15:[illegible]), "[illegible] is come when I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceeds from the Father, He shall [illegible]." ~~[illegible] the masculine pronoun He instead of it, shows that the Spirit is a person.~~ In (John 16:13-14) it is said, "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and [illegible]." Here there is no possibility of accounting for the use of the personal pronoun He on any other ground than the personality of the Spirit.

2. We stand in relations to the Holy Spirit which we can [illegible] only to a person. He is the object of our faith. We believe on the Holy Ghost. This [illegible] in [illegible]. [illegible] name of the Father, and of the Son, but [illegible] of the Holy Ghost. [illegible] association of the Spirit [illegible] connection with the Father and the Son [illegible] a person. [illegible] the Father and the Son, and [illegible] others. We stand in the same relation to the Spirit [illegible] the personality of the Son, or of the Father. [illegible] to believe on the Holy Ghost, but [illegible] He is [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the Holy Spirit. [illegible] be the object of our acts; [illegible] have [illegible], i. e., personal intercourse; [illegible] can say "thou" to us; and [illegible] can [illegible] in every [illegible].

3. The Holy Spirit also sustains relations to us, and [illegible] offices which none but a person can sustain or perform. He is our teacher, sanctifier, comforter, and guide. He governs every believer who is led by the Spirit, and His church. He calls, as He called Barnabas and Paul, to the work of the ministry, or to some special field of labor. Pastors or bishops are made overseers by the Holy Ghost.

4. In the exercise of these and other functions, personal [illegible] constantly attributed to the Spirit in the Bible; that is, such acts as imply intelligence, will, and activity or power. The Spirit searches, [illegible], removes and revealed. [illegible] often read that "the Spirit said." ([illegible]; Acts 21:11; I. Tim. 4:1) This is so frequently done, that the Spirit [illegible] as a personal agent from one end of the Scriptures to the other, so that His personality is beyond dispute. The only possible question is whether He is a distinct person from the Father. But of this there can be no reasonable doubt; as He is said to be the Spirit of God, and the Spirit which is of God; as He is distinguished from the Father in the [illegible] of baptism, and the Apostolic benediction; as He proceeds from the Father; and as He is promised, [illegible] by the Father. [illegible] Holy Spirit with the Father would be to [illegible] the Scriptures unintelligible.

5. All the elements of personality, namely, intelligence, will, and individual subsistence, are not only involved in all that is [illegible] [illegible] to Him, but [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible], [illegible] to act. He searches, [illegible] [illegible] of God. He [illegible] the things of God, [illegible] of God. (I. Cor. 2:10-12). He distributes "to every man [illegible] as He will" (I. Cor. 12:11). His individual subsistence is involved in His being an agent, and His being the object on which the activity of others terminates. If He can be loved, reverenced, and obeyed, or offended, grieved, and sinned against, He must be a person.

II. Deity.

This subject there is no dispute among God's people. The Spirit is so prominently presented in the Bible as possessing divine attributes, and exercising divine prerogatives, that since the fourth century His true divinity has never been denied by those who admit His personality.

1. In the Old Testament, all that is said of Jehovah is said of the Spirit of Jehovah; and, therefore, He must be divine. The expressions, Jehovah said, and the Spirit said, are constantly interchanged; and the acts of the Spirit are the acts of God.

2. In the New Testament, the language of Jehovah is quoted as the language of the Spirit. In Isa. 6:9, it is written, Jehovah said, "Go and tell this people," etc. This passage is thus quoted by Paul. (Acts 28:25) "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet," etc. In Jeremiah 31:31-33-34, it is said, "Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel;" which is quoted by the apostle in Heb. 10:15, saying, "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that He had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts," etc. Thus constantly the language of God is quoted as the language of the Holy Ghost. The prophets were the messengers of God; they uttered His words, delivered His commands, pronounced His threatenings, and announced His promises, because they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. They were the organs of God, because they were the organs of the Spirit.

[illegible] Man then, must be all.

[illegible] Eph. [illegible]:- [illegible] 6:19: "[illegible] in [illegible], [illegible]." In Rom. 7:9-16, the intellect or mind is said to be the intelligence of the spirit of truth, and that it is said to be the intelligence of the spirit of lies. In Rom. 7:1-4, [illegible] because he lies against the Holy Ghost.

[illegible] and the spiritual constituent (part of the Holy Spirit) as [illegible] all divine revelations. [illegible], "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. (Matt. 12:31) The unpardonable sin, then, is a sin against the Holy Ghost. This could not be unless the Holy Ghost were God. Paul, in I Cor. 2:10-11, says that the Spirit knows all things, even the deep things (the most secret purposes) of God. The knowledge is commensurate with the knowledge of God. He knows the mind of God as the spirit of man knows the things of a man. The consciousness of God is the consciousness of the spirit. The spirit therefore is God. The spirit is omniscient and [illegible] attributes. "Within," he says, "[illegible] I [illegible] the spirit [illegible] shall I flee from thy presence? [illegible] 139:7-12). The presence of the Spirit is the presence of God. The spirit is expressed in the [illegible] "[illegible] [illegible] that I shall not see him: behold, I [illegible] behold him: but I [illegible] behold him: behold, I [illegible]." (Num. [illegible])

III. <u>The Spirit [illegible] the Holy and Divine</u>

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

II. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

V. [illegible] - Summary of Teaching.

[illegible]

(1) The Divine Idea is an indivisible one; but, for purposes of the other-incarnated worlds, which it thus produces, (2) Its power-limitation below, the [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] -- the [illegible] of [illegible]; the [illegible] [illegible]. (3) While Mind-Matter being proved [illegible] [illegible] the Divine nature, all the truths [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Hegel's [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] was [illegible] in the [illegible]. [illegible], therefore, [illegible] of [illegible]. It is a [illegible] [illegible] of the Hegelian [illegible], which interpretation, however, [illegible] not [illegible] by the law of [illegible], but by fact.

The [illegible] of the Hebrew hypothesis, which [illegible] theory was first proposed by Le Bon: assume that the universe is indefinitely long [illegible] in order to its present state. For, [illegible] to produce [illegible] universe as we see around us, [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] and the heavens."

It is admitted, of course, that, [illegible] this account [illegible] would be most natural to understand the word in its ordinary sense; but if that sense brings the Mosaic account into conflict with facts, and another sense avoids such conflict, then it is obligatory ours to adopt the other. Now if the word "day" be taken in the sense of "an indefinite period of time," a sense which it unquestionably has in other parts of Scripture, there is not only no discrepancy between the Mosaic account of the creation and the assumed facts of geology, but there is a most marvelous coincidence between them.

[illegible]

The cosmogony of [illegible] science teaches that the universe, "the heaven and the earth," was first in a chaotic or [illegible] state. The [illegible] of its development included the following steps: (1) [illegible] an immediate result. (2) [illegible] sphere. (3) [illegible] lining of the land and water, determining the [illegible]. (4) The idea of life in the lowest [illegible], and afterwards, [illegible] ly, in the lowest [illegible] less animal, [illegible]. (5) [illegible] light of the sun shining on the earth -- an essential [illegible] the display of the system of life. (6) Introduction of the [illegible] of life. (7) Introduction of mammals -- the [illegible] -- the class afterwards to be dignified by including a [illegible] intellectual nature. (8) Introduction of [illegible] [illegible]

scientific naturalists.

Dr. Dana further says, "The order of events in the Scripture cosmogony corresponds essentially with that which has been given. There was first a void and formless earth: this was literally true of the 'heavens and the earth,' if they were in the condition of a gaseous fluid. The succession is as follows:-

1. Light.

2. The dividing of the waters below from the waters above the earth (the word translated waters may mean fluid).

3. The dividing of the land and the water on the earth.

4. Vegetation; which Moses, appreciating the philosophical characteristic of the new creation distinguishing it from previous inorganic substances, defines as that 'which had seed in itself.'

5. The sun, moon, and stars.

6. The lower animals, those that swarm in the waters, and the creeping and flying species of the land.

7. Beasts of prey ('creeping' here meaning prowling).

8. Man.

In this succession, we observe not merely an order of events, like that deduced from science: there is a system in the arrangement, and a far-reaching prophecy, to which philosophy could not have attained, however instructed. The account recognized in creation two great eras of three days, or periods, each, -- an Inorganic and an Organic. Each of these eras opens with the appearance of light; the first, light created; the second, light from the sun for the special uses of the earth.

Each era ends in 'a day' of two great works -- the two shown to be distinct by being severally pronounced 'good.' On the third day, that closing the Inorganic Era, there was first the dividing of the land from the waters, and afterwards, the creation of vegetation, or the institution of a kingdom of life -- a world widely diverse from all that preceded it in the

ert. So on the sixth day, terminating the Organic Era, there was first the creation of mammals, and then a second for greater work, totally new in its grandest element, the creation of Man.

The arrangement is, then, as follows:-

I. THE INORGANIC ERA.

1st Day. - Light cosmical.

2nd Day. - The earth divided from the fluid around it, or individualized.

3rd Day. - 1. Outlining of the land and water.
2. Creation of vegetation.

II. THE ORGANIC ERA.

4th Day. - Light from the sun.

5th Day. - Creation of the lower order of animals.

6th Day. - 1. Creation of mammals.
2. Creation of man.

The record in the Bible is, therefore, profoundly philosophical in the scheme of creation which it presents. It is both true and divine. It is a declaration of authorship, both of creation and the Bible, on the first page of the sacred volume. "The first thought," says Dr. Dana, "that strikes the scientific reader of the Mosaic account of the creation is the evidence of divinity, not merely in the first verse of the record, and the successive fiats, but in the whole order of creation. There is so much that the most recent readings of science have for the first time explained, that the idea of man as the author becomes utterly incomprehensible. By proving the record true, science pronounces it divine; for who could have correctly narrated the secrets of eternity but God himself."

As the Bible is of God, it is certain that there can be no conflict between the teachings of the Scriptures and the facts of science. It is not with facts, but with theories, believers have to contend. Many theories have, from time to time, been presented, apparently or really in conflict with the Bible. But these theories have either proved to be false, or to harmonize

with the Lord of God, properly interpreted. So long as men believed that the earth was the centre of our system, the sun its satellite, and the stars its ornamentation, they of necessity understood the Bible in consistence with that hypothesis. But when it was discovered that the earth was only one of the smaller satellites of the sun, and that the stars were worlds, then faith, although at first staggered, soon grew strong enough to take it all in, and rejoice to find the Bible, and the Bible alone of all ancient books, was in full accord with these stupendous revelations of science. So will it ever be. True science and revelation go hand in hand.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

CHAPTER - XI.

ORIGIN OF MAN. Anthropology

The Scriptural account of the origin of man is contained in Genesis 1:26-27, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." and Gen. 11:7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

Two things are included in this account; first that man's body was formed by the immediate intervention of God. It did not grow; nor was it produced by any process of development. Secondly, the soul was breathed from God. He breathed into man "the breath of life," that is, that life which constituted him a man, a living creature bearing God's image.

It could not have been in bodily lineaments that there existed a resemblance between the creature and the Creator, for "God is a Spirit." Nor does it refer to the dominion which was granted to him over this lower world. In this respect he was the vicegerent, then, in some sense, the image of God. But it is evident that this cannot be brought into account, when we would determine in what the alleged image consisted. The image was that in which man was created, and cannot, therefore, be explained by rank or authority subsequently given. The New Testament settles the question about the import of the image of God in those passages which contain allusions to man's first creation, when, in regeneration, the lost image is restored, Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:24. Here the characteristics of the image are specified: "knowledge," "righteousness," and "true holiness;" or light in the understanding, rectitude in the will, sanctity in the purposes and affections. In this state his Maker pronounced him good: "very good," a be-

claration which implies the absence of all evil, and the possession of every excellence, physical, intellectual, and moral, which his nature as a man, and his condition as a free agent, could admit.

THE NATURE OF MAN.

The Scriptures teach that "God formed the body of man out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life and he became a living soul." According to this account, man consists of two distinct principles, a body and a soul: one material, the other immaterial; the one corporeal, the other spiritual. It is involved in this statement, first, that the soul of man is a substance; and, secondly, that it is a substance distinct from the body. So that in the constitution of man two distinct substances are included. The idea of substance is one of the primary truths of the reason. It is given in the consciousness of every man, and is therefore a part of the universal faith of men. We are conscious of our thoughts, feelings, and volitions. We know that these exercises or phenomena are constantly changing, but that there is something of which they are the exercises and manifestation. That something is the self which remains unchanged, which is the same identical something, yesterday, today, and to-morrow. The soul is, therefore, not a mere series of acts; nor is it a form of the life of God, nor is it a mere unsubstantial force, but a real subsistence. Whatever acts is, and what is is an entity. A nonentity is nothing, and nothing can neither have power nor produce effects. The soul of man, therefore, is an essence or entity or substance, the abiding subject of its varying states and exercises. The second point just mentioned is no less plain. As we can know nothing of substance but from its phenomena, and as we are forced by a law of our nature to believe in the existence of a substance of which the phenomena are the manifestition, so by an equally stringent necessity we are forced to believe that where the phenomena are not only different, but incompatible, there the substances are also different. As, therefore, the phenomena or properties of matter are essentially different from those of mind,

we are forced to conclude that matter and mind are two distinct substances; that the soul is not material nor the body spiritual. "To identify matter with mind" says Cousin in his Psychology, "or mind with matter; it is necessary to pretend that sensation, thought, volition, are reducible, in the last analysis, to solidity, extension, figure, diversibility, etc; or that solidity, extension, figure, etc., are reducible to sensation, thought, will." It may be said, therefore, despite of materialists and idealists, that it is intuitively certain that matter and mind are two distinct substances; and such has been the faith of the great body of mankind. This view of the nature of man which is presented in the original account of his creation, is sustained by the constant representations of the Bible.

The Scriptures do not formally teach any system of psychology, but there are certain truths relating both to our physical and mental constitution, which they constantly assume. They assume, as we have seen, that the soul is a substance; that it is a substance distinct from the body; and there are two, and not more than two, essential elements in man. This is evident, (1) From the distinction everywhere made between soul and body. Thus, in the original account of the creation a clear distinction is made between the body as formed from the dust of the earth, and the soul or principle of life, which was breathed into it from God. And in Gen. 5:19, it is said, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." As it was only the body that was formed out of the dust, it is only the body that is to return to dust. In. Eccles. 12:7, it is said, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Isa. 10:18, "shall consume.....both soul and body." Daniel says (7:15) "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body." Our Lord (Matt. 6:25) commands His disciples to take no thought for the body: and again (Matt. 10:28) "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Such is the constant representation in the Bible. The body and the soul are set forth as

substances, and the two together as constituting the whole man. (2) There is a second class of passages equally decisive as to this point. It consists of those in which the body is represented as a garment which is to be laid aside; a tabernacle or house in which the soul dwells, which it may leave and return to. Paul, on a certain occasion, did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body. Peter said he thought it meet as long as he was in this tabernacle to put his brethren in remembrance of the truth, "knowing," as he adds, "that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle." Paul, in 2 Cor. 5:1, says, "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, etc." In the same connection, he speaks of being unclothed and clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven; and of being absent from the body and present with the Lord, knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord. To the Philippians (1:23-24) he says, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (3) It is the common belief of mankind, the clearly revealed doctrine of the Bible, and part of the faith of the Church universal, that the soul can and does exist and act after death. If this be so, then the body and the soul are two distinct substances. The body may be disorganized, reduced to dust, dispersed, or even annihilated, and the soul retain its conscious life and activity. This doctrine was taught in the Old Testament, where the dead are represented as dwelling in Sheol (~~"the grave," "the unseen world"~~), whence they occasionally reappeared, as Samuel did to Saul. Our Lord says that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, (~~His declaring Himself to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are now living.~~) Moses and Elijah conversed with Christ on the Mount. To the dying thief our Lord said, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Paul, as we have seen, desired to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. He knew that his conscious personal existence was to be continued after the dissolution of his body. (~~It is needless to dwell on this point, as~~) The continued existence of the soul in full

consciousness and activity out of the body and in the interval between death and the resurrection is not denied by any Christian Church. But if this be so it clearly proves that the soul and body are two distinct substances, so that the soul can exist independently of the body.

RELATION OF SOUL AND BODY. - Dichotomy.

Man, then, according to the Scriptures, is a created spirit in vital union with a material organized body. The relation between these two constituents of our nature is admitted to be mysterious, incomprehensible. We do not know how the body acts on the mind, or how the mind acts on the body. These facts, however, are plain, (1) That the relation between the two is a vital union, in such a sense as that the soul is the source of life to the body. When the soul leaves the body the body ceases to live. It loses its activity and sensibility, and becomes at once subject to the chemical laws which govern unorganized matter, and by their operation is soon reduced to dust, undistinguishable from the earth whence it was taken. (2) It is a fact of consciousness that certain states of the body produce certain corresponding states of the mind. The mind sees, the mind hears, and the mind feels; not directly or immediately (at least in our normal or present state), but through or by means of the appropriate organs of the body. It is also a matter of daily experience that a healthful condition of the body is necessary to a healthful state of the mind; that certain diseases or disorders of the one produce derangement in the operations of the other. Emotions of the mind affect the body; shame suffuses the cheek; joy causes the heart to beat and the eyes to shine. A blow on the head renders the mind unconscious, i. e., it renders the brain unfit to be the organ of its activity; and a diseased condition of the brain may cause irregular action in the mind, as in lunacy. All this is incomprehensible, but it is undeniable. (3) It is also a fact of consciousness that, while certain operations of the body are independent of the conscious voluntary action of the mind, as the process of respiration, digestion, secretion, assimilation, etc., there are certain actions dependent

on the will. We can will to move; and we can exert a greater or less degree of muscular force. It is better to admit these simple facts of consciousness and of experience, and to confess that, while they prove an intimate and vital union between the mind and body, they do not enable us to comprehend the nature of that union, than to have recourse to arbitrary and fanciful theories which deny these facts, because we cannot explain them. This is done by the advocates of occasional causes, which deny any action of the mind on the body or of the body on the mind, but refer all to the immediate agency of God.

REALISTIC DUALISM.

The Scriptural doctrine of the nature of man as a created spirit in vital union with an organized body, consisting, therefore, of two, and only two, distinct elements or substances, matter and mind, is one of great importance. It is intimately connected with some of the most important doctrines of the Bible; with the constitution of the person of Christ, and consequently with the nature of His redeeming work and of His relation to the children of men; with the doctrine of the fall, original sin, and of regeneration, and with the doctrines of a future state, and of the resurrection. It is because of this connection, and not because of its interest as a question in psychology, that the true idea of man demands the careful investigation of the Bible student. The Scriptures teach the existence of two distinct real entities, or substances; the one extended, tangible, and divisible, the object of the senses; the other unextended and indivisible, the thinking, feeling, and willing subject in man. This doctrine stands opposed to materialism and idealism, which, although antagonistic systems in other respects, agree in denying any dualism of substance. The one makes the mind a function of the body; the other makes the body a form of the mind.

The Scriptural doctrine of man is, of course, opposed to the old heathen doctrine which represents man as the form in which nature comes to self-consciousness; and also to the wider pantheistic doctrine according to

which men are the highest manifestations [illegible] le[illegible] being and life; and to the doctrine [illegible] impersonal, universal reason or logos (λόγος), [illegible] zation. According to this last mentioned view, [illegible] (σῶμα) soul, psuche (ψυχή) and logos (λόγος), or the impersonal reason. This is very nearly the Apollinarian doctrine as to the constitution of Christ [illegible] all mankind.

TRICHOTOMY.

The Scriptural doctrine is opposed to trichotomy or the doctrine that man consists of three distinct substances, body, soul, and spirit; soma (σῶμα), psuche (ψυχή) and pneuma (πνεῦμα); corpus, anima, and animus. This view of the nature of man is of more importance to the theologian because it has not only been held to a greater or less extent by some christians, but also because it has greatly influenced the form in which other doctrines have been presented; and because it seems to have some support from the Scriptures themselves. The doctrine has been held in different forms. The simplest, the most intelligible, and the one most commonly adopted is, that the body is the material part of our constitution; the soul, or psuka, is the principle of animal life; and the mind, pneuma, is the principle of our rational and immortal life. When a plant dies its material organization is dissolved and the principle of vegetable life which it contains [illegible]. When a brute dies its body returns to dust, and the psuka, or principle of animal life by which it was animated, passes away. When a man dies his body returns to the earth, his psuka, or soul, ceases to exist, his pneuma, or spirit, alone remains until reunited with the body at the resurrection.

TRICHOTOMY ANTI-SCRIPTURAL.

In opposition to all forms of trichotomy, or the doctrine of a threefold substance in the constitution of man, it may be remarked, (1) That it is opposed to the account of the creation of man as given in Gen. 2:7. According to that Scripture God formed [illegible] breathed into him the breath of life [illegible]

ing soul. There is in this account no intimation of anything more than the material body formed of the dust and the living principle derived from God. (2) This doctrine of Trichotomy is opposed to the uniform usage of Scripture. So far from the soul being distinguished from the mind as originally different or as derived from it, these words all designate one and the same thing. They are constantly interchanged in the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Scriptures. The one is substituted for the other, and all that is, or can be predicted of the one, is predicted of other. The Scriptures, therefore, speak of the soul not only as that which lives or is the principle of life to the body, but as that which thinks and feels, which may be saved or lost, which survives the body and is immortal. The soul is the man himself, that in which his identity and personality reside. It is the Ego. Higher than the soul there is nothing in man. Therefore it is so often used as a synonym for self. Every soul is every man; my soul is I; his soul is he. "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul? It is the soul that sins (Lev. 4:2); it is the soul that loves God. We are commanded to love God with all our soul. Hope is called the anchor of the soul, and the word of God is able to save the soul. The end of our faith is said to be the salvation of our souls (I. Peter 1:9); and John saw in heaven the souls of them that were slain for the word of God (Rev. 6:9; 22:4). From all this it is evident that the word soul does not designate the mere animal part of our nature, and is not a substance different from the spirit. (3) All the words for soul and spirit in Hebrew, in Greek and in English are used in the Scriptures indiscriminately of men and of irrational animals. If the Bible ascribed only a soul to brutes and both soul and spirit to man, there would be some ground for assuming that the two are essentially distinct. But such is not the case. The living principle in the brute is called both soul and spirit. That principle in the brute creation is irrational and mortal; in man it is rational and immortal. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." Eccles. 3:21.

The soul of the bruit is the immaterial principle which constitutes its life, and which is endowed with sensibility, and that measure of intelligence which observation shows the lower animals possess. The soul in man is a created spirit of a higher order, which has not only the attributes of sensibility, memory, and instinct, but also the higher powers which pertain to our intellectual, moral, and religious life. As in the brutes it is not one substance that feels and another that remembers; so in man it is not one substance that is the subject of sensations, and another substance which has intuition of necessary truths, and which is endowed with conscience and a knowledge of God. Philosophers speak of world-consciousness, or the immediate cognizance which we have of what is without us; of self-consciousness, or the knowledge of what is within us; and of God-consciousness, or our knowledge and sense of God. These all belong to one and the same immaterial, rational substance. (4) It is legitimate to appeal to the testimony of consciousness on this subject. We are conscious of our bodies and we are conscious of our souls, i. e., of the exercises and states of each; but no man is conscious of the soul as distinct and different from the spirit. In other words consciousness reveals the existence of two substances in the constitution of our nature; but it does not reveal the existence of three substances, and therefore the existence of more than two cannot rationally be assumed. (5) The passages of Scriptures which are cited as favoring the opposite doctrine may all be explained in consistency with the current representations of Scripture on this subject. When Paul says to the Thessalonians, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," (I. Thess. 5:23), he only uses a periphrasis for the whole man. In Luke 1:46-47, the virgin says, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour," soul and spirit are here used to signify the same thing. When we are commanded, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, with all thy strength and with all thy mind." (Luke 10:27), we have not an enumeration of so many distinct substances. All Protestants maintain that the soul and spirit are one and the same substance and essence.

Chapter XIII.

THE COVENANTS.

Was man in his original state placed simply under a law, or also under a covenant? The difference between the two is sufficiently plain. A law is the will of the sovereign, sanctioned by threatened punishment. A covenant is a stipulation or agreement, which, although it may have the nature and sanctions of a law, promises a reward upon certain conditions to be fulfilled by the creature, and an alternative penalty to be inflicted in case the condition fails.

(διαθήκη) (διατίθημι)

The Greek word diathēkē is derived from the verb diatithēmi and signifies to arrange, and, therefore, in ordinary Greek is used for any arrangement, or disposition. In the Scriptures it is uniformly used in the sense of a covenant.

In Scripture we read of various covenants; such as those made with Noah, Abraham, and the Hebrews at large. Anciently covenants were made and ratified with great solemnity. The Scriptures allude to the cutting of animals asunder, denoting that, in the same manner, the perjured and covenant-breaker should be cut asunder by the vengeance of God, (Jer. 34:18.) The covenants which relate to the human race are generally called the covenant of works and the covenant of grace.

The covenant of works is that whereby God requires perfect obedience from his creatures, in such a manner as to make no express provision for the pardon of offenses committed against the precepts of it on the repentance of such offenders, but pronounces a sentence of death upon them, (Gen. 2:15-16-17; Gal. 4:24; Psalm 89:3-4.)

The covenant of grace is generally defined to be that which was made with Christ, as the second Adam, and in him with all believers as His seed. (Is. 42:1-6; I. Pet. 1:20; Is. 53:10.)

1. The covenant of works was made with Adam; the condition of which was his perseverance in perfect obedience during the whole of his probation; the reward annexed to this obedience was the continuance of him and his posterity in such happy

holiness and felicity he then had, while upon earth, and everlasting life with God hereafter. The penalty threatened for the violation of the command was condemnation; terminating in death temporal, spiritual, and eternal. The seals of this covenant were, the tree of knowledge and the tree of life; and, perhaps, the Sabbath and Paradise (Gen. 2nd & 3rd chs; Col. 6:24; Rom. 5:12-19). This covenant was broken by Adam's eating the forbidden fruit, whereby he and his posterity were all subject to ruin. (Gen. 3: Rom. 5:12-19); and without the intervention of divine grace and mercy, would have been lost forever. Rom. 3:23. The Divine Being, foreseeing this, in infinite wisdom and unspeakable compassion, planned the covenant of grace, by virtue of which his people are reinstated in the blessings of purity, knowledge, and felicity, and that without a possibility of any farther defalcation.

2. The covenant of grace. Some divines make a distinction between the covenant of redemption and that of grace; the former, they say, was made with Christ in eternity; the latter with believers in time. Others object to this, and regard it a needless distinction for there is but one covenant of grace, and not two, in which the head and members are concerned; and, besides, the covenant of grace, properly speaking, could not be made between God and man; for what can man restipulate with God, which is in his power to do or give him, and which God has not a prior right unto? Fallen man has neither inclination to yield obedience, nor power to perform it.

The parties, therefore, in this covenant are generally said to be the Father and the Son, but the Holy Ghost should not be excluded, since He is promised in it and, in consequence of it, is sent down into the hearts of believers; and which must be by agreement and with His consent. If we believe in a Trinity, it is more ~~proper~~ appropriate to conclude that all were engaged in this plan of the covenant, than to suppose that the Father and Son were engaged exclusive of the Holy Spirit. (I. John 5:6-7) As to the work of the Son, it was the will and appointment of the Father that he should take the

charge and care of his people, (John 6:39; Heb. 2:13) redeem them by his blood (John 17, Heb. 10) obey the law in their room, (Rom. 10:4) justify them by his righteousness, (Rom. 9:24) and finally preserve them to glory. (Isa. 40:11) Jesus Christ became the representative and covenant head of his people, (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18) They were all considered in him, and represented by him, (Eph. 1:4); promises of grace and glory made to them in him (Tit. 1:2; I. Cor. 1:30); he suffered in their stead (2 Cor. 5:21). He is also to be considered as the mediator of the covenant by whom justice is satisfied, and man reconciled to God. (I. Tim. 2:5-6.) He is also the surety of this covenant, (Heb. 7:22), as he took the whole debt upon him, freed his people from the charge, obeyed the law, and engaged to bring his people to glory, (Heb. 2:13; Isa. 49:5-6.) He is called the testator of the covenant, which is denominated a Testament, (Heb. 7:22 and 9:15). He disposes his blessings, according to his will or testament, which is unalterable, signed by his hand, and sealed by his blood. In this covenant, as we before observed, the Holy Spirit is also engaged. His assent is given to every part thereof; he brings his people into the enjoyment of its blessings (I. Pet. 1:2; II. Thess. 2:13). He was concerned in the incarnation of Christ, (Matt. 1:18) and assisted his human nature (Heb. 9:14). He takes of the things of Christ, and shows them unto us; cleanses, enlightens, sanctifies, establishes, and comforts his people, according to the plan of the covenant. (Rom. 8:15-16-26.)

3. The properties of this covenant are such as these: (a) It is eternal, being made before time. (Eph. 1:3-4; II. Tim. 1:9) (b) Divine as to its origin, springing entirely from free unmerited grace. (Rom. 11:5-6; Psalm 89:2-3-28). (c) It is absolute and unconditional (Eph. 1:6-9) (d) It is perfect and complete, wanting nothing (II Sam. 23:5). (e) It is sure and immovable. (Isa. 54:10 and 55:3) (f) called new in opposition to the old, and so its blessings will be ever new (Heb. 8:6-13).

4. These two covenants agree in some things, in others they differ. (a) In both the parties concerned are God and man. (b) In both the [illegible]

promise of eternal life. (c) The condition of both is the same, perfect obedience prescribed; for it is not worthy of God to admit man to a blessed communion with Him but in the way of holiness. (d) In both is the same end, the glory of God.

But they differ in the following respects: (a) In the covenant of works, the character or relation of God is that of a supreme lawgiver, and the chief good, rejoicing to communicate happiness to his creatures. In the covenant of grace he appears as infinitely merciful, adjudging life to the believing penitent sinner, agreeably to his wisdom and justice. (b) In the covenant of works there was no mediator; the covenant of grace has a mediator, Christ. (c) In the covenant of works, the condition of perfect obedience was required to be performed by man himself in covenant. In the covenant of grace the same condition is proposed, but to be performed by a mediator. (d) In the covenant of works man is considered as working, and the reward is to be given of debt. In the covenant of grace the man in covenant is considered as believing; eternal life being given as the merit of the mediator, out of free grace, which excludes all boasting. (e) The special end of the covenant of works was the manifestation of the holiness, goodness, and justice of God; but the special end of the covenant of grace, is the praise of the glory of his grace, and the revelation of his unsearchable wisdom. (f) The covenant of works was only for a time, but the covenant of grace stands sure forever.

5. <u>The administration of the covenant of grace.</u> Under the Old Testament it was exhibited by promises, sacrifices, types, ordinances, and prophecies. Under the New it is administered in the preaching of the Gospel, baptism, and the Lord's supper; in which grace and salvation are held forth in more fullness, evidence, and efficacy to all nations. (II Cor. 3:6-18; Heb. 8; Matt. 28:19-20). But in both Testaments, the mediator, the whole substance, blessings and manner of obtaining an interest therein by faith are the very same, without any difference. (Heb. 11:6; Gal. 3:7-14).

Chapter XIII.

DIFFERENT DISPENSATIONS.

The First, from Adam to Abraham.

Although the covenant of grace has always been the same, the dispensations of that covenant have changed. The first dispensation extended from Adam to Abraham. Of this period we have so few records, that we cannot determine how far the truth was revealed, or what measures were adopted for its preservation. All we know is, that the original promises concerning the seed of the woman, as the Redeemer of our race, had been given and that the worship of God by sacrifices had been instituted. That sacrifices were a divine institution, and designed to teach the method of salvation, may be inferred, (1) From the fact that it is the method which the common consciousness of men has led them to adopt everywhere. It is that which their relation to God as sinners demand. It is the dictate of conscience that guilt requires expiation; and that expiation is made by the shedding of blood. Sacrifices, therefore, not being an arbitrary institution, but one having its foundation in our real relation to God as sinners, we may infer that it was by His command, direct or indirect, that such sacrifices were offered. (2) This may also be inferred from God's approving them, adopting them, and incorporating them in the religious observances subsequently enjoined. (3) The fact that man was to be saved by the sacrifice of Christ, and that this was the great event to which the institutions of the earlier dispensations refer, renders it clear that this reference was designed, and that it was founded upon the institution of God.

THE SECOND DISPENSATION.

The second dispensation extended from Abraham to Moses. This was distinguished from the former, (1) By the selection of the descendants of Abraham to be the peculiar people of God. They were chosen in order to preserve the knowledge of the true religion in the midst of the general apostacy of mankind. To this end special revelations were made to them, and God an-

tered into a covenant with them, promising that He would be their God, and that they should be His people. (2) Besides thus gathering His Church out of the world, and making its members a peculiar people, distinguished by circumcision from the Gentiles around them, the promise of redemption was made more definite. The Redeemer was to be of the seed of Abraham. He was to be one person. The salvation He was to accomplish should pertain to all nations. (3) Subsequently it was made known that the Deliverer was to be of the tribe of Judah.

THE THIRD DISPENSATION.

The third dispensation of this covenant was from Moses to Christ. All that belonged to the previous periods was taken up and included in this. A multitude of new ordinances of polity, worship, and religion were enjoined. A priesthood and a complicated system of sacrifices were introduced. The promises were rendered more definite, setting forth more clearly by the instructions of the prophets the person and work of the coming Redeemer as the prophet, priest, and king of His people. The nature of the redemption He was to effect and the nature of the kingdom He was to establish were thus more and more clearly revealed. We have the direct authority of the New Testament for believing that the covenant of grace, or plan of salvation, thus underlay the whole of the institutions of the Mosaic period, and that their principal design was to teach through types and symbols what is now taught in explicit terms in the gospel. Moses, we are told, (Heb. 3:5), was faithful as a servant to testify concerning the things which were to be spoken afterward.

Besides this evangelical character which unquestionably belongs to the Mosaic covenant, it is presented in two other aspects in the word of God. First, it was a national covenant with the Hebrew people. In this view the parties were God and the people of Israel, the promise was national security and prosperity; the condition was the obedience of the people as a nation to the Mosaic law; and the Mediator was Moses. In this aspect it was a legal

covenant. It said, "Do this and live." Secondly, it contained, as does also the New Testament, a renewed proclamation of the original covenant of works. It is as true now as in the days of Eden, it always has been and always must be true, that rational creatures who perfectly obey the law of God are blessed in the enjoyment of His favor; and that those who sin are subject to His wrath and curse. Our Lord assured the young man who came to Him for instruction that if he kept the commandments he should live. And Paul says (Rom. 2:6) that God will render to every man according to his deeds; tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; but glory, honour, and peace to every one who worketh good. This arises from the relation of intelligent creatures to God. It is in fact nothing but a declaration of the Eternal and immutable principles of justice. If a man rejects or neglects the gospel, these are the principles, as Paul teaches in the opening chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, according to which he will be judged. If he will not be under grace, if he will not accede to the method of salvation by grace, he is of necessity under the law.

These different aspects under which the Mosaic economy is presented account for the apparently inconsistent way in which it is spoken of in the New Testament. (1) When viewed in relation to the people of God before the advent, it is represented as divine and obligatory. (2) When viewed in relation to the state of the church after the advent, it is declared to be obsolete. It is represented as the lifeless husk from which the living kernel and germ have been extracted, a body from which the soul has departed. (3) When viewed according to its true import and design as a preparatory dispensation of the covenant of grace, it is spoken of as teaching the same gospel, the same method of salvation as that which the Apostles themselves preached. (4) When viewed in the light in which it was regarded by those who rejected the gospel, as a mere legal system, it was declared to be a ministration of condemnation and death. (II. Cor. 3:6-10) (5) And when contrasted with the new or Christian economy, as a different mode of revealing

the same covenant, it is spoken of as a state of tutelage and bondage; far different from the freedom and filial spirit of the dispensation under which we live.

THE GOSPEL DISPENSATION.

The gospel dispensation is called new in reference to the Mosaic economy, which was old, and about to vanish away. It is distinguished from the old economy, -

1. In being universal, confined to no one people, but designed and adapted to all nations and to all classes of men.

2. It is more spiritual, not only in that the types and ceremonies of the Old Testament are done away, but also in that the revelation itself is more inward and spiritual. What was then made known objectively, is now, to a greater extent, written on the heart. (Heb. 8:8-11) It is incomparably more clear and explicit in its teachings.

3. It is more purely evangelical. Even the New Testament, as we have seen, contains a legal element, it reveals the law still as a covenant of works binding on those who reject the gospel; but in the New Testament the gospel greatly predominates over the law. Whereas, under the Old Testament, the law predominated over the gospel.

4. The Christian economy is specially the dispensation of the Spirit. The great blessing promised of old, as consequent on the coming of Christ, was the effusion of the Spirit on all flesh, i. e., on all nations and all classes of men. This was so distinguishing a characteristic of the Messianic period that the evangelist says, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (John 7:39). Our Lord promised that after his death and ascension He would send the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, to abide with his people, to guide them into the knowledge of the truth, and to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come. He charged the apostles to remain at Jerusalem until they had received this power from on high. And in explanation of the events of the day

of Pentecost, the Apostle Peter said, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." (Acts 2:32-33).

5. The old dispensation was temporary and preparatory; the new is permanent and final. In sending forth His disciples to preach the gospel, and in promising them the gift of the Spirit, He assured them that He would be with them in that work to the end of the world. This dispensation is, therefore, the last before the restoration of all things; the last, that is, designed for the conversion of men and the ingathering of the saints. Afterward comes the end; the resurrection and the final judgment.

In the Old Testament there are frequent intimations of another and a better economy, to which the Mosaic institutions were merely preparatory. But we have no intimation in Scripture that the dispensation of the Spirit is to give way for a new and better dispensation for the conversion of the nations. When the gospel is fully preached then comes the end.

Chapter XIV.

MAN. HIS ORIGINAL STATE AND FALL.

Section 1.

Man was created, not evolved. This is expressly declared, (Gen. 1:26-27; Gen. 2:7-21-23) and the declaration confirmed by Christ (Matt. 19:4; Mark 10:6). There is "an enormous gulf, a divergence practically infinite between the lowest man and the highest beast." (Huxley) Man was created in the "image and likeness" of God. This "image" is found chiefly in man's tri-unity, and in his moral nature. Intellection, emotion, will. The New Testament, however, settles the question about the import of the image of God in those passages which contain allusions to man's first creation, when, in regeneration, the lost image is restored. (Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:24) Here the properties of the image are specified: "Knowledge," "righteousness," and "true holiness" or Light in the understanding, rectitude in the will, sanctity in the purposes and affections. In this state his Maker pronounced him good; "very good," a declaration which implies the absence of all evil, and the possession of every excellence, physical, intellectual, and moral, which his nature as a man, and his condition as a free agent, could admit.

Now, the law under which our first parents were placed is styled in the Scriptures "the first or old covenant," and is commonly called by divines the covenant of works in distinction from the new or second covenant, of which Christ is the Mediator and which is called the covenant of grace." (Dwight's Tehology). The conditions of that covenant may be summed up in one word -- obedience; full obedience in every point, and this to be performed without any intermission, from the moment man became a living soul till the time of his trial should be ended. By his faithful adherance to these conditions, he was to be continued in the possession of all his blessings, love and joy, life and immortality (this is manifestly implied in Gen. 2:9-17; Gen. 5:22; Gal. 5:19); while disobedience was to be followed by the loss of

all, and by the infliction of all the evils comprised in the dreadful word "death." This was the covenant, the agreement into which the Creator entered with His sinless creature; and that man did enter willingly into this covenant will appear from the fact that the human will was in perfect unison with the Divine. He cordially obeyed the law, accepted the promises, and determined to avoid the threatened evil.

Adam was under a law which required supreme love to God, and entire obedience to His commands. The command to abstain from eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:17) was only made as a special and decisive test of that general obedience. And we can conceive nothing more fitting.

1. The restraint reminded him that he was under a law to his Maker; that though lord of creation, he was in subjection to the authority of God; and the continued abstinence from the prohibited fruit would be regarded as an open proclamation, in view of heaven and earth, of unquestioning obedience to the will of God. What more just than this?

2. From the comparatively trivial character of the action prohibited, it taught the important lesson that the real guilt of sin lay in its principle, the principle of rebellion against God's will; not in the extent of the mischief done, or in the consequences arising out of it. What more important than this?

3. It concentrated man's obedience into a single point, brought the duty which he was required to perform up to his view in the most distinct manner possible, and rendered it too intelligible to be mistaken. No room was left for doubt or debate - a matter of special importance to him, so lately brought into existence, so unversed in argumentation, acquainted with plain facts only, and under the guidance of nothing but common sense. What more kind than this? Thus, there is no ground for the unbeliever's scorn. The prohibition has only to be examined to show forth the justice, the wisdom, and the benevolence of Him who imposed it.

The turpitude of Adam's sin has often been made the subject of unhallowed remark by ungodly men. "How could it be," they say, "that God should condemn man for the mere eating of an apple?" as if the sin was to be measured by the mere value of the fruit that was taken. But there cannot be a more false measure of moral turpitude.

1. Because the sin consisted in disobeying his Maker, revolting from His authority, and rebelling against His government. Whatever was the mode, whatever was the instrument of the rebellion, the sin was substantially the same; the same authority was denied, the same obligation broken, and, of course, the same guilt incurred.

2. The sin involved the breach of the whole moral law -- the law of love under which our first parents were placed. There was unbelief -- a principle, which makes God a liar - a transfer of his confidence from God to a malignant and apostate spirit. There was ingratitude and discontent with the rich provision God had made for his happiness; there was pride, a desire for elevation by unlawful means; there was self-will and insubordination to God; and there was alienation of heart, engendered by receiving the calumnies which the tempter cast upon God.

3. The sin was intensely aggravated by the smallness of the temptation; for although, in one view, some perverse spirits, who are determined to cavil, may consider this as rendering the offense proportionately diminutive and trifling, yet in another and far juster sense this ought to stamp it with the deeper malignity and guilt, inasmuch as the strength of the evil principle manifested in the commission of any sin is shown to be great in proportion as the temptation to the commission of it is small.

4. The sin was greatly aggravated by the perfect nature they possessed. No cloud was upon the understanding. They had the power to control the appetite, and keep in subjection the otherwise mutinous inclinations of sensitive nature, and at the same time they were surrounded with motives and helps to retain their innocency. And yet, in spite of all, they dared to rebel, and thus unpatriotically to requite the Author of their being and

blessedness. In all right views of the character and government of God and the condition of man, that first act of human rebellion involved a combination of atrocious evils which led the way to deserved misery. And this is a consideration that ought to rescue the subject from the unfeeling criticism with which it is often treated by the philosophers and scorners of this world.

Section II.

The penalty annexed to the first transgression was death. That this included may be learned from the general meaning of the term as it is used in the Scriptures, and from the evils that fell on the guilty pair in fulfilment of the ordained penalty.

1. That the penalty included the dissolution of the body is generally admitted (Gen. 3:19). Driven from the tree of life, the virtues of which were doubtless ordained to be the natural means of preserving the body in undecaying vigor, they were not subject to the wastings of disease and the decay of age; and finally the sentence was to be executed - "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But, viewing the phrase to die in the light thrown upon it by the principles of the Gospel, we reveal it as comprising what is technically called --

2. Spiritual death. This consists in a separation of the soul from communion with God, who is the source of spiritual life, and is manifested by the dominion of earthly and corrupt dispositions and habits, and an entire indifference or aversion to all spiritual and heavenly things. This separation from God, Adam sustained in the day, the hour, he ate the forbidden fruit; and of this he gave immediate proof, showing by his conduct that the love of God was extinguished in his soul, which was now alienated from the life of God. He was now under the power of servile fear, so that he fled from the presence of the Lord. So little did he retain even of the knowledge of Him who filleth heaven and earth, that he endeavored to hide himself from the Lord God" (Gen. 3:8); so that he [illegible]

the love of God, without which the image of God could not subsist. In the room of this, he had sunk into pride and self-will, into sensual appetites and desires, the very image of the evil one.

3. But the principal sense of the term "death," in the Scriptures, is the punishment of the soul in a future state, by loss of happiness, a separation from God, and a positive infliction of divine wrath (Rom. 6:23; James 1:15). To this curse Adam became exposed by his fall; and nothing but an intervention of mercy, so mighty and so majestic as to satisfy the demands of justice, could save the progenitor of our race from the pangs and horrors of this "second death."

But the full penalty was not immediately inflicted. An economy of grace and restoration was at once introduced, the revelation of a Saviour was made, and a charter of redemption was unfolded (Gen. 3:15). The import of this prediction appears from various allusions of Scripture to have been, that the Messiah, who was in an eminent and peculiar sense 'the Seed of the woman,' though, Himself bruised in the conflict, should obtain a complete victory over the malice and power of Satan, and so restore those benefits to man which by sin he had lost. How far this promise of mercy was understood by our first parents we are unable to determine. It was, however, sufficient to banish despair, encourage hope, and become the foundation of repentance and confidence in the Divine merty through the intervention of the Divine Redeemer. As expressive of his confidence and hope, Adam at once gave to his wife a new name - Eve, that is Life -- because she was to be the mother of that Living One who was destined to give life to the world. It is evident, also, that animals were very soon offered to God in sacrifice through faith in the promise of a Saviour, and that there was one appointed place where a visible symbol of the Divine presence was fixed, before which the humble worshiper might present himself, his offering, and his prayer. This visible symbol of the Divine presence, or Shekinah, was appropriately called "the presence of the Lord," (Gen. 4:16). It was doubtless the same radiant flame which turned

every way (Gen. 3:24), and was like the glory which afterward filled the temple. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel were probably offered before this celestial brightness; for when Cain was rejected, it is said that he "departed from the presence of the Lord." (Gen. 4:16)

Section III.

The federal and representative relation of Adam to his descendants is not stated in direct language in the history of the fall. But the testimony of other parts of Scripture on this subject is so explicit that all attempts to evade it have been in vain.

1. It is proven by the parallel drawn by the Apostle between the first and second Adam -- the parallel lying chiefly in this one point, that each acted a public part, standing for others, not for himself merely -- a part from which important results were to arise to those whom they are considered respectively as representing. The point of parallelism is noticed in general terms in (Rom. 5:14), where Adam is called, with evident allusion to his public representative character, "the figure," "type," or "model" of "Him that was to come;" and it is especially brought out in Rom. 5:18-19; I. Cor. 15:22-47).

2. It is proven by the fact that the curse pronounced upon Adam and Eve has taken effect on all their posterity. (Gen. 3:16-19).

3. It is proven by the fact that the Bible declares that sin, death, and all penal evils, came into the world through Adam (Rom. 5:12-21; I. Cor. 15:22). Adam drew down into his ruin the old creation (Rom. 8:19-22) of which he was lord and head. Christ brings into moral unity with God, and into eternal life, the new creation of which He is Lord and Head. (Eph.1:22-23)

Section IV.

Sin.

Sin is the transgression of the law, or want of conformity to the will of God. (I. John 3:4).

Original Sin is that whereby our whole nature is corrupted, and rendered contrary to the law of God. This is sometimes called indwelling sin,

(Rom. 7). The imputation of the sin of Adam to his posterity is what divines generally call, with some latitude of expression, original sin.

Actual sin is a direct violation of God's law, and generally applied to those who are capable of committing moral evil; as opposed to idiots or children who have not the right use of their powers.

Sins of omission consist in the leaving those things undone which ought to be done.

Sins of commission consist in doing those things which should not be done.

Sins of infirmity consists in such a failing as proceeds from excusable ignorance, or unavoidable surprise, or want of courage and strength. (Rom. 15:1).

1. Original sin, or Birth sin is the transmission of hereditary guilt and depravity to all the natural progeny of the first sinning pair. This is not merely a doctrine in religion, it is a fact in man's world acknowledged by all, whether religious or not. Let a man be providing for an unborn child; in case of distribution of worldly property, he will take care to bind him by conditions and covenants which shall guard against his fraudulently helping himself to that which he is to hold for, or to apportion to another. He never saw that child; he does not know but that child may be the most pure and perfect of men; but he knows that it will not be safe to put temptation in his way, because he knows he will be born in sin, and liable to sin, and sure to commit sin.

No one has ever taught the doctrine of original sin so impressively as Jesus Christ, and yet He never mentioned it. His whole scheme was founded on the assumption that men were wrong. Every call to a new point, every frown upon sin, every encouragement of well-doing meant that society needed regeneration. Men may come upon the doctrine of original depravity in one of two different ways; for example, they may come upon it as a dogma in theology. The first thing some theologians do is to abuse human nature, to describe it as being covered with wounds and bruises and putrifying sores,

gift of grace," refers to the whole benefit given by the abounding grace of God through the obedience of Christ. And this is pronounced to be co-extensive with the curse. It follows, therefore, that all children dying in infancy are adjudged to life. They are not, indeed, born justified and regenerate; but they are born under "the free gift;" and since they are incapable of a voluntary rejection of it, they receive the full benefit, which effectually cures the spiritual death and corrupt tendency of their nature, and then passes to its issue "justification of life." In the case of adults, "the free gift" comes upon them, in its effects, very largely, independently of anything they do. They are favored with the influences of the Holy Spirit, the means of grace, and the offers of mercy. In a word, "justification of life" is offered to them, it is pressed upon them; they are clearly instructed in the means by which, even considered as personal offenders, they may obtain it. If they yield and embrace the offer, then the end, for which "the free gift" came upon them, is attained; and they fail of it only by rejecting it.

In reference to the heathen, if it be asked to what extent and with what results they have received "the gift by grace which is by one man," we answer, God knoweth. That they do receive it is certain (Rom. 2: 12-16); and "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," they will be dealt with righteously according to the circumstances in which they have been placed. I am not authorized to say that God uses no other channels of grace than those that we know, and that in the sovereignty of His love He cannot make up to men who are in darkness that salvation which we have failed to send them, and give them a reflected light, at least, of that glory which shines full on us.

2. The principal heresies with which we are brought in contact in considering this subject are --

(1) Pelagianism. This system derived its name from Pelagius, a British monk, who, at the commencement of the fifth century, went to Rome,

Jerusalem, and other places propagating his opinions and gaining disciples. It teaches, (a) That Adam was by nature mortal, and, whether he had sinned or not, would have died. (b) That the consequences of Adam's sin were confined to his own person. (c) That infants are in the same situation with Adam before the fall. (d) That the law qualified men for the kingdom of heaven, and was founded upon equal promises with the gospel. (e) That the general resurrection of the dead does not follow in virtue of our Saviour's resurrection. (f) That the grace of God is given according to our merits.

2. Socinianism. This system denies the atonement of Christ, rejects also the doctrine of original sin, and maintains substantially the same views concerning human nature as those taught by Pelagius. There is some difference, however, between ancient and modern Socinians. The latter, indignant at the name Socinian, have appropriated to themselves that of Unitarians. (a) They reject the doctrine of a miraculous conception and the worship of Christ. (2) That Christ is not truly a Divine Being, but an exalted and pre-eminent pattern of human perfection. (c) That the Scriptures are not a revelation, but the record of a revelation. (d) That the Sabbath or Lord's Day of Christians is not to be considered as "set apart from our common lives to religion," nor is it to be regarded as more "holy" than any other day of the week. (e) That it is doubtful whether the soul is a substance or principle separate from the body. (f) That there are no such spiritual beings as the devil, or evil angels. (g) That the Scriptures do not teach the doctrine of eternal punishment of the wicked.

Chapter ~~XIV.~~ XV. Section I

THE ATONEMENT.

1. The word atonement is pure English, and literally signifies to be at one. As used in theology, it refers to the death of Jesus Christ as the means by which God and man became one -- restored to a state of reconciliation. The word is often found in the Old Testament -- the Hebrew word kappar of which it is a translation, signifying primarily "to cover," "to overspread;" it comes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify to atone, to appease, to pacify, to procure favor, because the effect of these is to cover, or in Scripture meaning to remit offenses. (Ex. 29:33; Num. 16:46-47; Ezek. 16:63) In accordance with this meaning of the word, the Septuagint renders it by exilasko, "to appease," "to make propitious," the very word which is employed in the New Testament with regard to the object of the Saviour's death (Heb. 2:17); and which as a noun hilasmos occurs (I. John 2:2; 4:10).

2. The Scriptures teach that "the death of Christ was vicarious and propitiatory; and that by it a satisfaction was offered to the Divine justice for the transgressions of men, in consideration of which, pardon and salvation are offered to them in the Gospel through faith." The following passages are a mere specimen of those that might be selected to show how the doctrine of atonement, as thus stated, pervades the whole of the Scriptures: Isa. 53:5-12; Matt. 20:28; Matt. 26:28; John 1:29; John 6:51; Rom. 5:6-9; II. Cor. 5:21; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:7; I. Tim. 2:6; Heb. 9:14-26-28; I. Pet. 2:24; I. John 1:7; Rev. 1:5-6.

If such scriptures as these do not convey the ideas of substitution and atonement, is it possible by human language to convey these ideas at all? What other words and phrases would we select, if it were our desire to express them more definitely?

In studying all Divine truths, and especially a truth like this which involves the nature of God, His mysterious dealings, and the relations

which it has pleased Him to establish between Himself and man -- topics the most arduous and delicate in the whole range of theology -- we must be careful to accept with the utmost simplicity and confidence the declarations of Holy Scripture. It is presumption to go into such a subject at all, except so far as God has been pleased to lead us.

When we see men disputing about the method of atonement, we marvel at them. It is as if a man that was starving to death should insist upon going into a laboratory to ascertain in what way dirt germinates wheat. It is as if a man perishing from hunger should insist on the chemical analysis of bread. God has, in His great love for his sinful children, provided a plan of salvation, in His own way, and we should gratefully and gladly accept it. It is impossible to know more than what He has revealed. If men would forbear to explain further there would be more Christianity and less controversy.

The points in the doctrine of the atonement which present most difficulty to the natural understanding are, first, the necessity of any suffering in order to procure human redemption; and, secondly, the imputation to the innocent of the sins of the guilty. It may alleviate these difficulties for such minds to remember that almost all temporal blessings are purchased at the expense of sorrow and sacrifice somewhere. We move in the midst of comforts furnished by the severe toil of others. Our lives are supported by animal food and in providing this animal food some innocent creature is made to bleed and die. However it be accounted for, "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain," brings forth in labor and sorrow, runs through its brief course of vanity, and ends in death. What countenance then, or authority, from nature, have men for objecting to the Cross of Christ? the Cross of Christ did not make a new truth; it was rather the manifestation of a world-old truth. For my part I find the Cross of Christ, not an untrue revelation of what was a Divine condition , before Jesus was born or the prophecies written.

Why is an innocent person to suffer even one pang of bodily pain

for the sins of the guilty? I care not to say why; for to our limited capacities many of God's dealings are utterly inscrutable; but I cannot be blind to the fact that so it is in the world of nature ; why then should I refuse to believe that His dealings in the world of grace will be characterized by the same great feature, that, in Scripture phraseology, "Christ was made sin for us, in order that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

3. That the death of Christ was really vicarious is proved by those Scriptures which speak of Christ as a propriation for sin. (I. John 2:2; I. John 4:10; Rom. 3:25) The word used in the two former passages is (ἱλασμος) hilasmos; in the last (ἱλαστηριον) hilasterion; both are from the verb (ἱλασκω) hilasko, which means "to propitiate," "to appease," "to atone," "to turn away the wrath of an offended person." The noun is often used and signifies a sacrifice of atonement. (Lev. 6:6-7; Numb. 5:8; Ezek. 44:27) (ἱλαστηριον) Hilasterion occurs only twice in the New Testament (Rom. 3:25 and Heb. 9:5), and signifies "mercy-seat." The mercy-seat was sprinkled with atoning blood on the day of atonement (Lev. 16:14) in token that the righteous sentence of the law had been (typically) carried out so that what must else have been a judgment-seat could righteously be a mercy-seat (Heb. 9:11-15; Heb. 4:14-16), a place of communion (Ex. 25:21-22). In fulfilment of the type Christ is Himself the hilasmos, "that which propitiates," and the hilasterion, "the place of propitiation" -- the mercy-seat sprinkled with His own blood -- the token that in our stead He so honored the law by enduring its righteous sentence that God reveals Himself as the God of grace, hears our prayers, and dispenses His mercy. And as under the law God was propitious to those only who appeared before His mercy-seat with the blood of their sin offerings (Lev. 16:2-3; 11-16); so under the Gospel dispensation He is accessible to sinners, as supplicants for mercy, only as they come to Him through faith in that blood of sprinkling, which is shed for the sins of the world. These passages, therefore, which speak of Our Lord as a "propitiation," directly refer to His vicarious sufferings as the means by which the Divine Being was rendered propitious or

favorable to guilty men. Here we should note that the Old Testament sacrifices did not take away sins or make at-one the sinner and God. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10:4). The Israelite's offering implied confession of sin and its due desert, death, and God "covered," ("passed over" Rom. 3:25) his sin in anticipation of Christ's sacrifice which did finally put away the sins "done aforetime in the forbearance of God." (Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:15). (λύτρον),

4. This doctrine is taught by those Scriptures that speak of Christ as a ransom for sinners (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; I. Tim. 2:6). The word in Timothy is antilutron, (ἀντιλύτρον) which denotes the ransom paid for the life of a captive, or slave by giving up the life of another—the idea involved in both words being that of substitution or satisfaction. The lutron in the case of a man is "the precious blood of Christ," who "came to give His life a ransom for many." According to this view we are said to be redeemed by Christ. The Greek word lutroo, (λυτρόω) "to loose," "to set free by paying a price." (I. Peter 1:18-19; Gal. 3:13; II. Cor. 5:21). By this ransom we are delivered from bondage and death, and the blessings we had forfeited by sin are restored to us. The Divine favor, adoption into God's family, a restoration to His image, an inheritance among the saints in light, and immortality and glory -- all these were lost, but are now restored through the Redeemer's death. They are our "purchased possession to the praise of His glory." How the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings and death of Jesus Christ could have been in plainer or more forceful language expressed we do not know. (Read also these Scriptures: I. Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4; II. Cor. 5:14-15; Heb. 2:9-10; I. Peter 3:18).

5. Christ Himself proclaimed the atoning and propitiatory character of His death. To the Christian Christ is what He declared Himself to be, both as to His person and His mission. He said, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many." (Matt. 20:28) The multitude throng Him, that they may eat of the loaves, and He tells them of the "flesh" and "blood" which "He will give

for the life of the world" (John 6:51-55). As the Good Shepherd, He giveth His life for the sheep (John 10:11). That "lifting up" is the condition of His "drawing all men to Him," partly, indeed as with the cords of a man, through the marvellous attraction of His patience, meekness, agony; but partly, also, as with the cords of an everlasting love, and the power of a Divine act (John 12:32-33). From the first, He had proclaimed the forgiveness of sins as the great work which He came on earth to accomplish; had wrought signs and wonders in attestation of His power to forgive them (Matt. 9:5-6; Mark 2:5-7-10-11; Luke 5:23-24); but as the hour of His death drew nigh, He declared that His blood was "shed for many for the remission of their sins" (Matt. 26:28). As Moses had sprinkled the blood of the victims upon the people, baptizing them, as it were, into the covenant of Sinai, so His blood was to be the sign and token of a new covenant, making the first old; differing from the first in pointing, not to a law written on the tables of stone, but to one written on the tables of men's hearts; but, like that, resting on the idea of sacrifice. If we interpret the life of Christ by His own words, we cannot reduce Him to the level of a legislator, or a teacher, or a reformer, or the restorer of a theocracy. The idea of sacrifice is conspicuous throughout His whole ministry. The preaching of Paul and all the other apostles is but the natural development of Christ's own teaching.

7. The Levitical sacrifices were types prepared and designed by God to prefigure the true atonement that was to be made for sin in the fullness of time. This is expressly declared in Heb. 10:1, where the Apostle, discoursing on the "sacrifices" of the tabernacle, calls them "a <u>shadow</u> of good things to come"; now, as a shadow corresponds exactly to the substance which produces it, so do the ordinances of Judiasm describe, by adumbration, the grand new covenant propitiation. In Heb. 9:8-14, the same Apostle tells us that "the first tabernacle," with "the gifts and sacrifices" offered therein, was "a figure" of "a greater and more perfect tabernacle" and of "His own blood," with which our Lord "obtained eternal redemption for us." The Apostle

proceeds on the assumption, that in Christ is fully realized and accomplished all that the Levitical law foreshadowed and predicted. This connection is so intimate that the very names of the victims offered under the law are transferred to Christ. He is called thusia, "a sacrifice" (Eph. 5:2); hamartia, "a sin offering" (II. Cor. 5:21); hilasmos, a "propitiation" (I. John 2:2); hilasterion, "a propitiatory or mercy-seat" (Rom. 3:25); prosphora, "an offering or oblation" (Eph. 5:2; Heb. 10:14); apolutrosis, "redemption" (I. Cor. 1:30); lutron, "a ransom" (Matt. 20:28); antilutron, "a ransom price" (I. Tim. 2:6). Now, these are the very terms which, in the Old Testament, are applied to the sacrificial victims of the Mosaic dispensation. Of course, the application of these terms to Christ is, in the highest sense proper, for they are applied to Him by the Spirit of Truth; and while they mark His connection with the Levitical institution, they clearly evince the atoning object of His death. His death could have had no relation to the Levitical immolations and offerings if it had no sacrificial character. And nothing could have been more misleading and even absurd than to apply those terms which were in use to express the various processes and means of atonement, if the Apostles and Christ Himself did not intend to represent His death strictly as an expiation for sin. Admit that the ceremonial law was a system of shadows and figures Divinely adapted to foreshow and prepare the world for Christ, and this at once imparts meaning, consistency, and glory to the whole; and affords additional proof that He who was thus typified was the grand universal sin-offering for the world.

~~CHAPTER XV.~~ Section II

EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

This leads us to enquire for whom did Christ die? - This is a question between Augustinians and Anti-Augustinians. The former believing that God from all eternity having elected some to everlasting life, had a special reference to their salvation in the mission and work of His Son. The latter, denying that there has been any such election of a part of the human family to salvation, maintain that the mission and work of Christ had an equal reference to all mankind.

1. The leading principles taught by Augustine are the same as those of Calvin. The main doctrines by which Calvanists are distinguished from Arminians are reduced to five articles; and which, from their being the principal points discussed at the Synod of Dort, A. D. 1618, have been dominated in the five points. These are, predestination, particular redemption, total depravity, effectual calling, and the certain perseverance of the saints.

The Calvanistic doctrine of a limited atonement is based upon certain views concerning the election of grace. These views are given in the "Westminster Confession of Faith." "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto eternal life, and others foreordained to everlasting death..... Those of mankind that are predestined unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His spirit working in

due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the inscrutable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." There have been two leading schemes of predestination generally known by the names of Supralapsarianism and Infralapsarianism. According to the former, God, in order to manifest His grace and justice, selected from creatable men (that is from men to be created) a certain number to be vessels of mercy, and certain others to be vessels of wrath. In the order of thought, election and reprobation precede the purpose to create and to permit the fall. Creation is in order to redemption. God creates some to be saved, and others to be lost. According to the latter, God, with the design to reveal His own glory, that is, the perfections of His own nature, determined to create the world, to permit the fall of man to elect from the mass of fallen men a multitude whom no man could number as "vessels of mercy," to send His Son for their redemption, and to leave the residue of mankind, as He left the fallen angels, to suffer the just punishment for their sins.

2. The Arminian view of this subject will now be considered. This is briefly stated; that our Lord Jesus Christ did so die for all men as to make salvation attainable by every man that cometh into the world . (This view is not to be confounded with that of the Universalists). Arminians agree with Calvinists as to the matter of fact that some will be lost; but they deny that this will arise from any sovereign purpose of God to exclude them from, or deny them the grace of salvation, contending that if persons are not saved the fault is entirely their own, lying solely in their unwillingness to accept the salvation offered them, or to receive it on the terms on which it is presented.

I shall endeavor to consider this question with candor and fairness, for I am not unmindful of the fact that very many learned and excellent men have been arranged on each side; but while all honor should be given to the great and good men who have written on this question, yet we believe it forms a clear case of appeal to what God has Himself said.

The question, put in its most simple form, is, whether our Lord Jesus Christ did so die for all men, as to make salvation attainable by all men. We think the Scriptures abundantly establish this doctrine.

I remark here that there is not one passage in the Scriptures which says that Christ did not die for the salvation of all, or which limits the efficacy of the atonement to any select number of the race; not one in either the Old Testament or New, uttered by prophet, apostle, or Christ which teaches that doctrine in plain unequivocal language. But free and unmerited salvation is offered plainly and fully to all men:-

(1) In all those passages which declare that Christ died "for all men," and speak of His death as an atonement for the sins "of the whole world." When, therefore, it is said that Christ "by the grace of God tasted death for every man;" and that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not ours only, but for the sins of the whole world;" it can only, we think, be fairly concluded from such declarations and from many other similar Scriptures that, by the death of Christ, the sins of every man are rendered remissible, and that salvation is consequently attainable by every man. The angel at Bethlehem when Christ was born said, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

John the Baptist points Christ out as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Our Lord calls Himself "the Saviour of the world." Paul calls Him "the Saviour of all men." Again our Lord declares that "God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life; for God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved."

Paul says also that, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their tresspasses unto them."

(2) In those passages which attribute an equal benefit of the death of Christ as to the effects of the fall of our first parents, "For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." Broadly, the contrast is: Adam: sin, death; Christ: righteousness, life. Adam drew down into his ruin the old creation (Rom. 8:19-22) of which he was lord and federal head. Christ brings into moral unity with God, and into eternal life, the new creation of which He is Lord and federal Head.

To these may be added all those passages which ascribe the abolition of bodily death to Christ, who, in this respect, repairs the effect of the transgression of Adam, which He could only do in consequence of having redeemed that body from the power of the grave. This argument may be thus stated. It is taught in Scripture, that all shall rise from the dead. It is equally clear from the same authority, that all shall rise in consequence of the interposition of Christ, the second Adam, the representative and Redeemer of man -- "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." It follows, therefore, that if the wicked are raised from the dead, it is in consequence of the power which Christ, as Redeemer, acquired over them, and of His right in them. That this resurrection is to them a curse, was not in the purpose of God, but arises from their wilful rejection of the gospel. To be restored to life is in itself a blessing; that it is turned to a curse is their own fault; and if they are not raised from the dead in consequence of Christ's right in them, acquired by purchase, it behooves those of a different opinion to show under what other constitution than that of the gospel a resurrection of the body is provided for. The original law contains no intimation of this, nor of a general judgment, which latter supposes a suspension of the sentence inconsistent with the strictly legal penalty, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

(3) The unlimited extent of Christ's atonement to all mankind is plainly taught by those passages which declare that Christ died not only for those that are saved, but for those who do, or may perish; so that it cannot be argued, from the actual condemnation of men, that they were excepted from all the benefits of His death. "And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." False teachers, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. So also in the case of the apostates mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, and unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." If any dispute should here arise as to the phrase, "wherewith he was sanctified," then read the sixth chapter of the same epistle, where the same class of persons, whose doom is pronounced inevitable, are said to have been "once enlightened;" to have "tasted of the heavenly gift;" to have been "made partakers of the Holy Ghost;" to have "tasted the good word of God" and "the powers of the world to come:" all of these expressions show that they were placed on the same ground with other believers as to their interest in the new covenant.

(4) The same view is taught by all those passages which make it the duty of men to believe the gospel; and place them under guilt, and the penalty of death, for rejecting it. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not on the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "But these are written that "ye might believe" that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His name." "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (condemned) "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, inflaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." The plain argument from all these Scriptures is, that the Gospel is commanded to be preached to all men; that they may believe in Christ, its Author; that this faith is required of them, in order to their salvation, -- "that believing ye may have life through His name;" that they have power thus to believe to their salvation, which, as it can be bestowed only through the merits of Christ's sacrifice, proves that it extends to them. The same conclusion also follows from the nature of that faith, which is required by the gospel, in order to salvation. This salvation is not mere assent to the doctrine of Christ's sacrificial death, but personal trust in it as our atonement; which those, surely, could not be required by a God of truth and justice to exercise, if that atonement did not embrace them. Nor could they be guilty for refusing to trust in that which was never intended to be the object of their trust; for if God so designed to exclude them from the benefits of the atonement, He could not command them to trust in Christ; and if they are not commanded thus to trust in Christ, they do not violate any command by not believing; and, in this respect are innocent.

3. The Calvinistic doctrine of a limited atonement is based upon certain views concerning the election of grace. (See the first part of this ~~chapter.~~ section)

There are three kinds of election, of choosing and separating from others, spoken of in the Bible.

(1) There is the election or choosing of individuals to perform ~~some special service. In this sense the term~~ is applied to the priests under the law (Deut. 21:5; I. Sam. 2:27-28); to kings and rulers (Psalm 78:70); to prophets (Jer. 1:5); and to the Apostles of Christ (Luke 6:13; John 6:70;

Acts 9:15). This election appears to be on account of fitness for the services to be performed. Nothing to indicate that it was from all eternity, and nothing as to their final destiny.

(2) There is the election of nations, or bodies of people, to eminent religious privileges. Abraham, because of his fitness, and his family were selected from all the other nations to constitute the visible Church of God, to receive special revelations of truth, and to preserve among men the knowledge, worship, and obedience of the true God. Hence they are spoken of as His "chosen" or "elect" people (Deut. 4:37-7; 6-10; 15; Psalm 33:12; Isa. 41:8-9); and as He brought them out of Egypt, and, by many express declarations and acts of mercy, engaged them to adhere to Him as their God, He is said to "call" them, and they were His "called" (Isa. 41:8-9-48; 12-51; 2; Hos. 11:1); and as He had distinguished them from all other nations they are spoken of as His "peculiar" people (Deut. 7:6-14; 2-26; 18). But it will be noticed that all these privileges, honors and blessings belonged to all the descendants of Abraham without exception and without regard to any former righteousness (Deut. 9:4-5-6); That they were in mercy granted to the sons of Abraham for the good of all nations (Gen. 12:3; Exod. 9:16; Lev. 26:45); and that there was nothing in these privileges to ensure their absolute and final blessedness; great numbers of them fell under Divine vengeance for their sin (Exod. 32:8-27-28; Numb. 11:1-33; Numb. 16); and were excluded from the benefits of the promises (Heb. 3:7-11).

The term "election" under the Christian dispensation is also applied occasionally to communities -- all those who have embraced the gospel, even by profession, being called by the same appellations which had been before applied to the Jews. The Jews, as a people, had been deprived of election and church relationship of every kind for their rejection of Christ; and their privileges were transferred to believing Gentiles, who were called into that church relation and visible acknowledgment as the people of God which the Jews had formerly enjoyed. And wherever they were found in a collective body, professing allegiance to Christ, and maintaining the ordinances

of Christianity, the terms and distinctions which had for ages been given to the visible Church were now applied to them, and applied with the same latitude as they were before applied to the Jewish people. It was this calling and election of Gentile believers to the privileges of the Church of God that constituted "the mystery which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets"(Eph. 3:1-7). It was this that Paul defends in the ninth chapter of Romans, 25 to 33. And as the arrangement to bring believing Gentiles into the Church of God was no casual arrangement, but formed a part of God's original plan, they are said to be "the called according to His purpose " (Rom. 8:28), and to be "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4). In all these Scriptures there is not the most remote reference to an unconditional election to eternal life.

(3) There is a personal election -- the election of individuals to be the children of God and the heirs of salvation. There was, as we have seen, under the Abrahamic covenant the election of an entire nation in virtue of their natural descent. Under the Christian covenant, natural descent is disregarded, and faith in Christ is all in all. Every penitent believer, therefore, whether Jew or Gentile, is chosen in Christ to enjoy all the benefits of the gospel now and evermore. And to each one is applied the phrases which were borrowed from that collective election mentioned before, - "the elect of God," "chosen of God, " "chosen in Christ."

This personal election is explained in two passages; first in I. Peter 1:2, where believers are said to be "elect <u>through sanctification of the Spirit."</u> They are not elected, being unbelievers and unsanctified, in order to be sanctified by the Spirit. But they are elected <u>through</u> the sanctification of the Spirit. Their election is, therefore, strictly conditional; and though it takes place "according the foreknowledge of God," it is an act of God in time, and is intended to result in ever-increasing obedience and in the enjoyment of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Secondly, in II. Thess. 2:13-14, where the elect ones are said to be chosen "from the beginning,

that is, from the very first reception of the gospel in Thessalonica "through sanctification and belief of the truth," to ultimate and glorious salvation "whereunto," that is, to which sanctification and faith they were called by the gospel. Certain it is, that sanctification and belief of the truth cannot be the ends of election, if they are the means of it as this scripture teaches; we must therefore conclude that the personal election of believers is a choice into God's family of persons already believing and obedient. Nor does it in the least imply an exclusion of others from like precious blessings; nor does it render their final salvation irrevocably secure, they are, therefore, to give diligence to make their calling and election sure (II. Peter 1:10). And since God would have all men to be saved (I. Tim. 2:4), and will in no wise cast out any that come to Him (John 6:37), the number of the actually elect may be indefinitely increased. And as true believers may "turn back unto perdition," and be "cast away" the number of the elect may be indefinitely diminished.

From this it will be seen that we regard the absolute, eternal, unconditional election of a set or determinate number of persons to everlasting life as an invention of men which is utterly without support from the word of God; and that we regard the election of Grace as God's choice of those <u>who believe the gospel</u> to all the privileges and blessings of present salvation, and to the hope of eternal life through Jesus Christ. The doctrine of unconditional election is productive of the following evils: (1) It tends to perplex and confuse the mind, and renders all certainty on the subject of salvation impossible; (2) It tends to make the confident presumptious, and the timid and fearful despairing and melancholy; (3) It is at variance with the plain invitations of the gospel which are made to all men; (4) It greatly destroys human responsibility, and is unfavorable to personal solicitude and earnestness concerning religion; (5) It invests the Divine Being with the terrible charge of partiality; and (6) Seems to render the judgment-day unnecessary. On the other hand personal, conditional election, or the election of <u>character</u>, (1) Is in unison with the commission to preach the glad

tidings of salvation to all men; (3) It involves men in circumstances of individual responsibility; (4) Is favorable to personal holiness and christian diligence; and (5) Accords with man's responsibility, and the necessity for the judgment-day.

4. The doctrine of election to eternal life of only a certain determinate number of persons to salvation, involving, as it necessarily does, the doctrine of the absolute and unconditional reprobation of all the rest of mankind cannot, in our opinion, be reconciled:-

(1) To the Love of God. "God is love." "He is loving to every man; and His tender mercies are over all His works."

(2) Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under the necessity of sinning, and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the wisest and best of all -- Our Father and God.

(3) Nor to the grace of God, which is so often magnified in the Scriptures. On such a scheme can there be any interpretation given the passage "that where sin has abounded, grace might much more abound?" or in what sense has "the grace of God appeared unto all men?" Does it argue any superabounding richness of grace or mercy, when all men have equally offended Him, to pardon a few only and to reject all others -- to refuse them pardon, to place them utterly and absolutely, even before their birth, out of the reach of salvation? For all, except Adam and Eve, have come into the world with a nature which, left to itself, could not but sin, and as the determination of God, never to give the reprobate the means of avoiding sin, could not rest upon their fault, for what is absolutely inevitable cannot be charged on man as his fault, so it argues against the grace of God and places the condemnation of the lost upon the mere will and sovereign pleasure of God.

(4) Nor can it be reconciled to any of those numerous passages in which God is represented as tenderly compassionate, and pitiful to the worst

and most unworthy of His creatures, even to them who perish finally. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." "How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." "Being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." "The Lord is long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish." "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance, and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance."

(5) It is manifestly contrary to His justice. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right." "Are not my ways equal, saith the Lord." That a sovereign should condemn th death a large number of his subjects for not obeying laws which it is absolutely impossible for them to obey; and to require them, on pain of aggravated punishment, to do something in order to pardon and remission of their offences, which he knows they cannot do, implies a charge so awfully and obviously unjust against God who is "holy and just in all His doings," so exactly "just in the judgments which He executeth," that the reason of man repudiates the thought and refuses to entertain it.

(6) It is impossible to reconcile the doctrine of unconditional reprobation to the sincerity of God. The gospel, as we have seen, is commanded to be preached to "every creature;" which publication of "good news to every creature," is an offer of salvation to "every creature," accompanied with earnest invitations to embrace it and solemn warnings not to reject or despise it. Does it not involve a serious reflection upon the truth and sincerity of God, which men ought to shudder at, to assume, at the very time the gospel is thus preached, that no part of this good news was ever designed to benefit a large part of those to whom it is addressed?

(7) The doctrine of which we are showing the difficulties brings with it the notion of the eternal punishment of infants. That some of those who die in infancy are among the reprobate, which, according to this doctrine of eternal reprobation, cannot be denied, then all such infants are

eternally lost. Now we know that infants are not lost, because our Lord gave it as a reason why little children ought not to be hindered from coming unto Him, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven." In this Christ comprehends little children themselves and those who in disposition resemble them. The great consideration which leads to the solution of this matter and establishes the salvation of all infants is found in Rom. 5:18, "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." In these words, the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are pronounced to be co-extensive; the words applied to both are precisely the same, "judgment came upon all men," "the free gift came upon all men." If the whole race be meant in the former clause, the whole race is also meant in the latter; and it follows that as all are injured by the offence of Adam, so all are benefitted by the obedience of Christ. Whatever, therefore, that benefit may be, all children dying in infancy must partake of it, or there would be a large portion of the human race upon whom the "free gift," the effects of "the righteousness of one" did not "come," which is contrary to the apostle's teaching. Infants are not born justified and regenerate, so that to say that original sin is taken away by Christ , is not the correct view of the case, for the reason already given; but they are all born under the "free gift," the effects of the "rightdousness" of one, which extended to "all men;" and this "free gift" is bestowed on them in order to justification of life, and as children are incapable of rejecting that blessing they must, therefore, derive benefit from it. The doctrine that implies the perdition of infants is not, therefore, in harmony with the Scriptures.

I offer a few additional thoughts on the extent of the atonement. When our Lord constituted His church He had respect to the faith and obedience of those whom He chose. Peter, James, John and the other disciples did not become His followers in unbelief and disobedience. The very act of their becoming disciples of Christ implied unequivocally some degree both of faith

and obedience. They were chosen, not as men, but as believing men. God looks not on the outer part, but on the inner part, - the heart - the character. When He called individuals or a nation He had respect to character. It was so in the calling, or electing, or choosing of Abraham, Moses, Apostles, and all others. We do not know, however, how to limit Divine grace, for while we believe that no man is good enough to be saved without Christ, so also we believe that no man is so bad but that he may be saved by faith in Christ.

5. We now notice some texts that are supposed to give countenance to the doctrine of unconditional reprobation. Rom. 9:13. - "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." But this Scripture fails to sustain that doctrine; for it is not Jacob and Esau personally who are spoken of, but their posterity, as appears from Mal. 1:2-3, and from the Apostle's discourse. The term "hated" does not mean to reject or abhor, but to regard with a less degree of love, as is proved from Luke 14:26 and Matt. 10:37. The meaning of this passage is, God had certain benevolent purposes to accomplish and He preferred the posterity of Jacob to that of Esau as the medium through which these purposes should be accomplished. This He had a sovereign right to do. "So that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." (Rom. 9:16). Abraham willed that the blessing should be given to Ishmael; Isaac willed that it should be given to Esau; and Esau ran to hunt for venison that it might be regularly conveyed to him. But they were all disappointed; for God had intended that the blessing of being a great nation and a distinguished people should be given to Isaac and Jacob; and to this intention He adhered, for reasons sufficient to His own infinite wisdom. But though Jacob and his posterity were chosen to constitute the visible church and to be the progenitors of the Messiah, they were not on that account irrevocably saved, for of many of them it is said (Heb. 3:11) He swore that they should not enter into His rest; nor were Esau and his posterity irrevocably lost, for many of them were faithful servants of God.

There are two points in Rom. 9:17-18 claimed in favor of unconditional reprobation; namely, that of Pharaoh's being "raised up" (or, as it is supposed to mean, brought into existence) for the purpose of being a monument of Divine vengeance; and that of his being "hardened" by a direct influence from God. But in reference to Pharaoh's being "raised up," the original word he-emadtica has no reference to being born or brought into existence; it literally means "I have caused thee to stand." See Exod. 9:15-16 and it will be made plain. In the Hebrew the verbs are in the past tense, and not in the future as our translation improperly expresses them. And if translated, as they ought to be, in the subjunctive mood or in the past instead of the future, the passage will stand thus: "For if now I had stretched out My hand, and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, thou shouldst have been cut off from the earth. But, truly, on this very account I have caused thee to stand, that I might cause thee to see my power, and that My name may be declared throughout all the earth." Thus, God gave this wicked king to know that it was in consequence of His special providence that both he and his people had not been already destroyed by the plagues already sent; but God had spared him for this very purpose, that He might have a further opportunity of manifesting that He, Jehovah, was the only true God, for the full conviction of both the Hebrews and the Egyptians; that the former might follow, and the latter fear before Him. Judicious critics of almost all creeds have agreed to translate the original as above; a translation which is in strict conformity to both the Septuagint and Targum. (See Revised Version, also Dr. A. Clark on Exod. 9:15-16). There is, therefore, nothing in this text to countenance the notion that God had from all eternity appointed Pharaoh, and brought him into being to this end, that He might show His power in his destruction.

As to the other point, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, all who have read the Scriptures with care know that God is frequently represented in them as doing what He only permits to be done, Pharaoh made his own heart stubborn against God, he hardened his neck against Divine reproofs (Exod.8:15,

and 9:34); therefore God withdrew the influences of His grace and spirit, and gave him up to the blindness and hardness of his own heart, and as he repeatedly refused instruction and again and again hardened his heart so finally he became "a vessel of wrath, fitted" by his stubborness and disobedience," "for destruction" (Rom. 9:22), and at last was "suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy." (Prov. 29:1; II. Chron. 36:13). The sins of Pharaoh were his own voluntary acts; and his doom the result, not of any arbitrary decree, but of his wilful perversity and rebellion. Isa. 6:9-10, compared with Acts 28:25-27. -- In the former passage the prophet is represented as the agent or cause of the people's impenitence. This, however, is a form of speech which obtains in the prophetic writings, by which the prophets are said to perform the thing which they only declare or foretell (See Ezek. 43:3; Jer. 1:10); "Make the heart of this people fat," etc; that is, declare it to be stupid and senseless, and predict the removal from them the means of salvation which they have so long abused so that they shall not "see with their eyes," etc. And this agrees with the parallel passage in the Acts, where the blindness and impenitence are represented as the people's own -- a state they have brought upon themselves, and which is now to be punished by judicial blindness and obduracy. Our Lord gives the same meaning to the passage in Matt. 13:13-15; "Therefore speak I to them in parables, because they seeing, see not," ect. - in persuance of the general rule laid down in verse 12. He said in substance, 'I do not give more knowledge to this people, because they use not that which they already have, and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, "hearing ye shall hear" and not understand; all possible means shall be given you, yet they will profit you nothing, because your heart is sensual, stupid and insensible; your spiritual senses are shut up, yea, ye have closed your eyes against the light, as being unwilling to understand the things of God, and afraid, not desirous, that I should heal you.'

Another Scripture is relied on as teaching the doctrine of reprobation (I. Pet. 2:8). Our translation seems to imply that the disobedient

were appointed to be disobedient. But the original does not convey that idea. For the words in construction stand connected in this manner:- "The disobedient stumble against the word to which (word) they were appointed." They were appointed to stumble against the word, but not to be disobedient. Now, to understand what the Apostle means by the disobedient stumbling against the word, he alludes evidently to Isai. 8:14-15, where it is said, "And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and shall be broken;" consequently their being appointed to stumble must be taken in connection with the words "and fall and shall be broken," which follow in the same sentence, and which, being well known to his Jewish readers, the Apostle well knew they would readily understand. The meaning is, therefore, that they were appointed to be broken as the consequence and punishment of their stumbling and falling, which interpretation is confirmed by what Christ said in explication of Isaiah's prophecy (Matt. 21:44). To Israel Christ's coming not as a splendid monarch, but in the form of a servant, is a stumbling-stone and a rock of offence (Rom. 9:32-33; I. Cor. 1:23).

The doctrine of unconditional reprobation has no sanction in this Scripture. The people stumbled and fell through their obstinate unbelief; and thus their stumbling and falling, as well as their unbelief, were of themselves. In consequence of this they were appointed to be broken, God having appointed from all eternity, "He that believeth not shall be damned."

6. We now consider the terms "to call," "the called," and other somewhat similar terms which occur in the New Testament. "To call" signifies to invite to the blessings of the gospel; "the called are, consequently, the invited (Prov. 1:24; Matt. 22:14; Acts 2:39; Rom. 1:5-6; Gal. 1:6; I. Thess. 2:12).

Sometimes "the calling" is not an invitation to partake of spiritual benefits merely; but an invitation to form a spiritual society composed of believers, and to be formed into this fellowship for mutual benefit, and for the purpose of diffusing the benefits of the gospel among men (Rom. 8:30; I. Cor. 1:9; Col. 3:15). Those who accept this invitation, and join them-

selves to the church by faith and obedience, are spoken of as "partakers of the heavenly calling" (Heb. 3:1), and as "the called," because of their obedience to the invitation (Rom. 9:24; I. Cor. 1:24). As they were invited to this fellowship in accordance with God's original purpose as declared to Abraham (Gen. 17:4-5), they are said to be "the called according to His purpose" (Rom. 8:28). As the object of this church state is to promote holiness, it is termed a "holy calling" (II. Tim. 1:9). As sanctity is required of all the members, they are "called to be saints (Rom. 1:7). As the final result is to be eternal life, we hear of "the prize of the high calling (Phil. 3:14); "the hope of their calling" (Eph. 1:18 and 4:4); and of their being "called to His eternal glory" (I. Tim. 6:12; I. Thess. 2:12; II. Thess. 2:14; I. Peter 5:10). And as this final result is ensured to none but the faithful (Matt. 24:13; Rev. 2:10), they are to "give diligence to make their calling sure" (II. Peter 1:10-11).

To support the view that all those who are called must necessarily be obedient to the call (Rom. 11:29) is quoted. The context shows, however, that it has no such signification. Paul is speaking of the Jews who had rejected the gospel because the Gentiles had been admitted into the church. Paul means to say that the blessings which God freely bestowed on Abraham and his posterity, and His calling and making them His people, God had not changed His mind or repented, but He will restore to the Jews the honor of being His people when they have been turned from their unbelief. (Ezek. 16:60-62) (See Macknight on this text.)

"There's a wideness in God's mercy,
Like the sideness of the sea;
There's a kindness in His justice,
Which is more than liberty.

There's a welcome for the sinner,
And more graces for the good;
There's mercy with the Saviour,
There's healing in His blood.

For the love of God is broader
Than the measure of man's mind;
And the heart of the eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

If our love were but more simple,
We would take Him at His word;
And our lives would be all sunshine
In the sweetness of our Lord."

Faber.

CHAPTER XVI.

SALVATION.

The words for salvation both in Hebrew and Greek imply the ideas of deliverance, safety, preservation, healing and soundness. Salvation is the great inclusive word of the gospel gathering into itself all the redemptive acts and processes: as justification, redemption, grace, propitiation, forgiveness, sanctification, and glorification. Salvation is in three tenses:-

1. The believer has been saved from the guilt and penalty of sin (Lk. 7:50; I. Cor. 1:18; II. Cor. 2:15; II. Tim. 1:9).

2. The believer is being saved from the habit and dominion of sin (Rom. 6:14; Phil. 1:19; II. Thess. 2:13; Gal. 2:19-20).

3. The believer is to be saved in the sense of entire conformity to Christ (Rom. 13:11; Heb. 10:36; I. Pet. 1:5; I. John 3:2).

Salvation is by grace through faith, is a free gift, and wholly without works (Rom. 3:27-28; Rom. 4:1-8; Rom. 6:23; Eph. 2:8). The Divine order is salvation, then works (Eph. 2:9-10; Titus 3:5-8).

REPENTANCE.

Repentance is the translation of a Greek word (metanoia -- metanoeo) "to have another mind," "to change the mind," and is used in the New Testament to indicate a change of mind in respect of sin, of God and of self. This change of mind may, especially in the case of christians who have fallen into sin, be preceded by sorrow (II. Cor. 7:8-11), but sorrow for sin, though it may work repentance, is ~~it~~ not repentance. Repentance consists in conviction of sin, sorrow for it, confession of it, hatred to it, and renunciation of it.

Repentance is a simple operation of the mind understood by all persons, and in some form practiced by all. You cannot find a person who, at some time, has not exercised repentance. You cannot find a child who needs to be told what is meant by being required to repent when he has done a wrong thing; and in the emotions of a child, when he feels sorry that he has done

wrong, and who resolves to make confession of it and to do it no more, you have the elements of all that God requires of man as a condition of salvation.

But repentance, of itself, does not secure forgiveness of sin. Socinian and Deistical writers — in fact all who reject the doctrine of the atonement — maintain that from the relation that subsists between the Creator and the creature, there can be nothing needed, but that man, if he have offended, should repent; and that on his repentance, he is necessarily forgiven. There never was a theory which could draw less support, whether from reason, from experience, or from Scripture. When a man violates the law of the state does repentance secure a pardon? If property is wasted in proigality, will repentance restore it? If the life be stained by sin will repentance purify it? There is no Scripture to support the idea that repentance alone can procure pardon. If certain passages of Scripture seem to connect pardon with repentance the connection there asserted is rather remote than immediate, and repentance must, in such texts, be considered as leading to, and terminating in, the faith of the gospel and as only then crowned with remission of sins. Since it is entirely for the sake of the atonement made by Jesus Christ that God justifies us, He fitly and righteously requires from us a distinct recognition and cordial reception of that atonement. Now, thus to recognise and receive the atonement is in no sense the province of repentance, but the work of faith. It is "in Christ" that God is reconciling the world unto Himself. In order, therefore, to be pardoned, or reconciled, we must meet Him in His Son; and this we can never do, until to "repentance towards God," by which we confess, deplore, and renounce sin, we add that "faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" by which we accept and claim Him as our Saviour.

Does repentance, as connected with salvation, precede or follow the exercise of faith? There are many who insist that faith precedes repentance. We believe that repentance is exercised first. There is, however, a belief which precedes and induces rppentance -- a belief in the

those sins that have been committed, and the terrible consequences of a continuance in sin. In this way the Spirit convinceth of sin and gives power to repent. But the agency thus exercised by the Spirit is not that of compulsion -- it is not such as to destroy the freedom of man, or in any way to interfere with the proper exercise of his powers as a moral agent. And because he is free to exercise these powers he is commanded to repent, to yield himself to the influence of those views and feelings which the Spirit has awakened, to humble himself before God, to implore His mercy, and turn himself from his transgressions. When the gospel is presented to man, if he does not repent, it is because he will not. Many practical illustrations of repentance:- The Prodigal (Luke 15:17-21); The Publican (Luke 18: 13-14); Saul (Acts 9:5-6-11). Repentance may be repeatedly exercised -- as often as we become conscious of sin -- even to the end of life.

FAITH.

"Love, touched by the hand of faith, flames forth; Hope, fed at faith's table, grows strong and casts anchor within the veil; joy, courage, and zeal, being smiled upon by faith, are made invincible. What oil is to the wheels, what weights are to the clock, what wings are to the bird, what sails are to the ship, that faith is to all religious duties and services." (Brooks.)

"Hast thou faith?" To this an Apostle's question, all men could, in a sense, return an answer in the affirmative; for it is not more true that no man liveth and sinneth not, that no man liveth and believeth not; or devil either; for "the devils believe and tremble." Suppose a man without faith in any one, without faith in any one who serves him, faith in the affections of his children, faith in the integrity of his friends, faith in the fidelity of his wife, death would be to be preferred to such a life like his. Better that our eyes were closed in death than that they should see every one with a mask on his face and a dagger beneath his cloak; with such a jaundiced vision we should be "of all men the most miserable." On look-

ing into the matter, we find that faith, instead of belonging only to the people of God, devout and consecrated, is common to all, even the worst of men. It is the backbone, indeed, of the social, and the foundation of the commercial fabric; remove faith between man and man, and society and commerce fall to pieces. There is not a happy home on earth but stands on faith; our heads are pillowed on it; we sleep at night in its arms with greater security for the safety of our lives, peace, and property, than bolts and bars can give. "Faith is the substance (substantiating) of things hoped for, the evidence (conviction) of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1). This is the only definition of faith given us in the Bible.

As so much prominence is given to faith in the Scriptures; all the promises of God are addressed to believers, and all the conscious exercises of spiritual life involve the exercise of faith, without which they are impossible, hence the importance of this grace cannot be overestimated. When one dead in trespasses and in sin has his spiritual eyes opened and is renewed, his first conscious exercise is faith, as the first conscious exercise of one born blind, whose natural eyes have been opened, is seeing. To the man whose vision has been restored so many sensations and emotions are experienced that he cannot tell how much comes through the eye, and how much from other sources. This is true of the believer. As soon as his eyes are opened by the renewing of the Holy Spirit he is in a new world. "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." "He is a new creature" (II. Cor. 5:17). To the theologian, but especially to the christian, it is of the greatest importance that clear and correct ideas should be entertained on this subject. There is, however, some difficulty connected with it. This arises partly from the nature of the subject; partly from the fact that usage has assigned the word faith so many different meanings; partly from the arbitrary definitions given it by philosophers and theologians; and partly from the diversity of aspects under which it is presented in the Scriptures.

We will not here discuss the metaphysical and the psychological aspects of faith, but shall consider faith as a christian grace, the fruit of

the Spirit, those exercises of faith which are peculiar to the regenerated people of God. This is what is meant by saving faith. It will be necessary also to consider faith in relation to justification, sanctification, and holy living. When we are commanded to believe in Christ as the Saviour of the world, we are not required merely to assent to the proposition that He does save sinners, but also to receive and rest upon Him alone for our own personal salvation. What, therefore, the Scriptures mean by faith, in this connection, the faith which is required for salvation, is an act of the whole soul, of the understanding, of the heart, and of the will. It includes knowledge, assent, and trust. That knowledge is essential to faith is obvious. Faith includes the conviction of the truth of its object. It is an affirmation of the mind that the thing is true or trustworthy, but the mind can affirm nothing of that of which it knows nothing. The Bible everywhere teaches that without knowledge there can be no faith. The command of Christ was to preach the gospel to every creature, to teach all nations. Those who received the instructions thus given, He assured his disciples, should be saved, those who rejected them, should be damned. This implies that without knowledge of the gospel there can be no faith. Paul asks "How can they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" "Faith", he says, "cometh by hearing." On this principle the Apostles acted everywhere. They went preaching Christ, proving from the Scriptures that He was the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. The communication of knowledge always preceded the demand for faith. Such is the intimate connection between faith and knowledge, that in the Scriptures the one term is often used for the other. To know Christ, is to believe upon Him. To know the truth, is intelligently and believingly to apprehend and appropriate it. The Spirit is said to open the eyes of the understanding. Believers are children of the light. We are translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light. Nothing is more characteristic of the Bible than the importance which it attaches to the knowledge of the truth. We are said to be begotten

by the truth; to be sanctified by the truth; and the whole duty of ministers and teachers is said to be to hold forth the word of life. Because Protestants believe that knowledge is essential to faith that they insist so strenuously on the circulation of the Scriptures and the instruction of the people.

Roman Catholics teach that only a few primary truths of religion need be known and that faith without knowledge is sufficient. The faith required of the people is simply "A general intention to believe whatever the church believes." The church teaches that there are seven sacraments. A man who has no idea what a sacrament means is taught to believe that orders, penance, matrimony, and extreme unction, are sacraments. According to the teaching of Romanists, one may be a member of that communion, although in his modes of thought, he be a pantheist or pagan.

This is why the Bible is withheld from the people. If knowledge is not necessary to faith, there is no need that the people should know what the Bible teaches. For the same reason the services of public worship are conducted in an unknown tongue. The symbolism which characterizes their worship is to inspire a blind reverence and awe. There is no need that these symbols be understood. It is enough that they affect the imagination. The cross is held up before the people, but it is not necessary that the doctrine of the sacrifice for sin made thereon should be taught. The darker the mind, the more vague and mysterious the feeling excited, and the more blind the submission rendered, the more genuine the devotion. "Religious light," says Cardinal Newman, "is intellectual darkness." On this principle Roman Catholic missions have always been conducted. The people are received into the church, not by the truth being taught them but by baptism. They are added to that church by thousands, not by the intelligent adoption of Christianity as a system of doctrine, but by submission to the rites prescribed by that organization. The consequence has been that Catholic missions take no permanent hold on the people, but die out when these rites are discontinued.

Protestants do not teach that mere intellectual assent constitutes saving faith, for the object of saving faith is not simply the general truth of the Scriptures, not the fact that the gospel reveals God's plan of saving sinners; but it is Christ Himself; His person and work, and the offer of salvation to us personally and individually. From the nature of the case we cannot believe in Christ on the inward testimony of the Spirit which reveals His glory and His love without the feelings of reverence, love and trust mingling with the act and constituting its character. For is it possible that a soul oppressed with a sense of sin should receive the promise of deliverance from its guilt and power, without any feeling of gratitude and confidence. The act of faith in such a promise is in its nature an act of appropriation and confidence.

Accordingly we find that in many cases in the Bible the word trust is used instead of faith. The same act or state of mind which in one place is expressed by the one word, is in others expressed by the other. The same promises are made to trust as are made to faith. The same effects are attributed to the one that are attributed to the other. (Psalm 125:1); (Isai. 50:10); Job. 13:15); I. Tim. 4:10). The use of other words and forms of expression as explanatory of the act of faith, and substituted for that word, shows that it includes trust as an essential element of its nature. We are commanded to look to Christ, as the dying Israelites looked up to the brazen serpent. This looking involved trusting; and looking is declared to be believing. Sinners are exhorted to flee to Christ as a refuge. The man-slayer fled to the city of refuge because he relied upon it as a plan of safety. We are said to receive Christ, to rest upon Him, to lay hold of Him. All these, and other modes of expression which teach us what we are to do when we are commanded to believe, show that trust is an essential element in the act of saving faith.

The command to believe is expressed by the Greek word pistuo not only when followed by the accusative, but also when followed by the dative and by the prepositions, epi, eis, or en. But the literal meaning of pisteuein

eis, or epi, or en, is not simply to believe, but to believe upon, to confide in, to trust. Faith in a promise made to ourselves, from the nature of the case , is an act of confidence in him who makes the promise. The believer knows from his own experience that when he believes he receives and rests on Jesus Christ for salvation as He is freely offered to us in the gospel.

It is conceded that all christians are bound to believe, and that all do believe everything taught in the Scriptures, so far as the contents of the Scriptures are known to them. It is, therefore, correct to say that the object of faith is the whole revelation of God as made known in His Word. The Bible is then the only infallible rule of faith and practice, nothing not expressly taught in the Bible, or deduced therefrom by necessary inference, should be imposed on the people of God as an article of faith. This is "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free" and in which we stand.

The special object of faith, therefore, is Christ crucified, and the promise of salvation through Him. And the special definite act of faith which secures our salvation is the act of receiving and resting on Him as He is offered to us in the gospel. This is so clearly and variously taught in the Scriptures as hardly to admit of being doubted. Christ declares what men are required to do, and what they are condemned because they do not do, is to believe on Him. He was lifted up, "That whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3:15). "He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John 3:18) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36). "This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." (John 6:40,47,51). Christ is the immediate object of saving faith; and the act of receiving Him secures our salvation. (John 1:12);(John 5:43); (I. John 5:1,9-10-12).

The teaching of the apostles accords with this. Paul says we are justified "by faith in Christ." It is not faith as a general confidence in God; not faith in the truth of divine revelation, but that faith of which Christ is the object. "The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." "For we are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." "I live by faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me." Christ declares that He gave Himself as a ransom for us. He was set forth as a propitiation for sin; He offered Himself as a sacrifice unto God. It is through the merit of His righteousness and death that we are saved. If He is our Redeemer and Saviour, we must receive Him and trust Him as such. If He is a propitiation for sins it is through faith in His blood that we are reconciled to God. The whole plan of salvation, as set forth in the gospel, involves the idea that Christ, in His person and work, is the object of faith and the ground of confidence. We are in Him by faith. He dwells in us. He is the head from whom we, as members of His body, derive our life. He is the vine, we are the branches. It is not we that live, but Christ, who liveth in us. God sent His Son into the world, clothed in our nature, to reveal His will, to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification. Those who receive this Saviour as being all that He claimed to be, and commit their souls into His hands to be used in His service and saved to His glory, are, in the Scriptural sense of the term, believers. True believers take Christ as a Saviour, as a deliverer from the guilt and power of sin, and from the dominion of Satan. They take Him as their wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. They take Him as their God and Saviour, as the full, complete, satisfying, life-giving portion of the soul. If this complex act

of apprehension and surrender were analyzed it doubtless would be found to include submission to all Christ's teaching, reliance on His righteousness and intercession, subjection to His will, confidence in His protection, and devotion to His service. As He is offered to us as prophet, priest, and king, as such He is accepted. And as He is offered to us as a source of life, and glory, and blessedness, as the supreme object of adoration and love, as such He is joyfully accepted.

SOME EFFECTS OF FAITH.

1. Love is an invariable and constant attendant and consequent of saving faith. No one can see and believe a thing to be morally good without the feeling of approbation; so no one can see and believe the glory of God as revealed in the Scriptures without adoring reverence being awakened in his soul; no one can believe that Jesus Christ loved him and gave Himself a ransom for him, and made him a king and priest unto God, without love and devotion, in proportion to the clearness and strength of his faith, filling his heart and controlling his life. Hence faith is said to work by love and to purify the heart. (Gal. 5:6).

2. Union with Christ. This union is consumated by faith. We are "by nature the children of wrath even as others." (Eph. 2:3). To believe in Christ and to be in Christ, are, therefore, convertible terms. Those united with Christ, Paul teaches (Rom. 6:4-10), so as to be partakers of His death, are partakers also of His life. "Because I live ye shall live also," "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." (Rom. 8:10; Gal. 2:20; John 15:1-6; Eph. 1:22; I. Cor. 12:12-27; Eph. 4:15-16).

3. Justification, a forensic term and signifies the declaring or pronouncing a person righteous according to law. It stands opposed to condemnation; and this is the meaning of the word wherever it is used in an evangelical sense. (Rom. 5:15-18). Justification is substantially the same blessing as pardon. In a great variety of Scriptures justification, pardon, forgiveness, remission of sins, and terms of like import, are used synonymously.

(Acts 13:38-39; Luke 18:13-14; Rom. 4:5-8). This blessing is conferred on mankind in a manner which exhibits the righteousness or justice of God in equal prominence with His goodness and mercy. Justification is an act of mercy, indeed, but of mercy in connection with justice, and under its control. It is mercy that pardons but justice that justifies. Here the grand doctrine of the atonement of Christ is brought into view. A Being of infinite dignity has become the voluntary and all-sufficient Surety for sinful men. He died, the just for the unjust, sustaining the penalty of the law, and meeting the demands of justice; and on this account the law itself consents to the pardon of the offender, and God in His official character as judge, shows mercy upon terms that are consistent with a righteous government. Thus, "grace reigns through righteousness." (Rom. 5:17). God "is faithful and just to forgive our sins." (I. John 1:9) He is "just and the justifier of him that believeth" (See Rom. 3:21-26). As to the way and manner in which sinners are justified, it may be observed that the Divine Being can acquit none without a complete righteousness. Justification is evidently a legal term and the thing intended by it a judicial act. So that, were a person to be justified without righteousness, the judgment would be a false and unrighteous sentence. That righteousness by which we are justified must be equal to the demands of that law according to which the Judge proceeds in our justification. The law of God is perfect, the only condition of justification is in perfect righteousness. But where shall we find, or obtain a justifying righteousness? Not in the law, or our good works, for by these "no flesh shall be justified in His sight," (Rom.3:30). Our righteousness is imperfect and consequently cannot justify. If justification were by the works of men, it could not be by grace; there would be no need of the righteousness of Christ. If justification were by the law, then would boasting be encouraged; whereas God's design in the whole plan of salvation is to exclude it,(Rom. 3:27; Eph. 2:8-9). Nor is faith itself our righteousness, or that for the sake of which we are justified; for,

though believers are said to be justified by faith, yet not for faith, faith can only be considered as the instrument, and not the cause. That faith is not our righteousness, is evident from the following considerations: No man's faith is perfect, and, if it were, it would not be equal to the divine law. It could not, therefore, without an error in judgment, be accounted a complete righteousness. But the judgment of God, as stated before, is according to truth, and the rights of His law. That obedience by which a sinner is justified is called the righteousness of faith, righteousness by faith, and is represented as revealed to faith; consequently, cannot be faith itself. Faith in the matter of justification stands opposed to all works; "to him that worketh not but believeth." That which is the end of the law is our righteousness, which certainly is not faith, but the obedience of our exalted and immaculate Substitute and Saviour, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," (Rom. 10:4). Were faith itself our justifying righteousness, we might depend upon it before God. So that upon this hypothesis not Christ, but faith would become the principal object of dependance and trust, which is absurd. The gospel excludes our righteousness in every form and points all to Jesus Christ "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," (I. Cor. 1:30). "By grace ye are saved, etc." (Eph. 2:8-9). "By Jesus Christ all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:38-39). "He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification, (Rom. 4:25). "Being justified by His blood we shall be saved from wrath through Him" (Rom. 5:9). The perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings, and the cruel death on the cross of our Surety and Redeemer constitute that righteousness by which sinners are justified. "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous (Rom. 5:19). "He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." (II. Cor. 5:21). "And be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness which is

of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ; the righteousness which is of God by faith," (Phil. 3:8).

The properties of justification:-

(1) It is an act of God's free unmerited grace (Rom. 3:24).

(2) It is an act of justice as well as grace, the law being perfectly fulfilled in Christ, and divine justice satisfied (Rom. 3:26).

(3) It is an individual and instantaneous act, done at once, giving the believing sinner a complete pardon.

In concluding would say that justifying faith has respect in general to all that Christ in the gospel is set forth as doing and suffering in order to our redemption and pardon. But it has respect in particular to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The acts or exercises of this faith appear to be three:-

(1) The assent of the understanding to the truth of the testimony of God in the gospel, and especially to that part of it which concerns the design and efficacy of the death of Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for sin.

(2) The consent of the will and affections to the plan of salvation; such an approbation and choice of it as imply a renunciation of every other refuge, and a steady and decided adherence to this.

(3) Actual trust in Jesus Christ as Saviour, and personal apprehension of His merits.

On the whole, may it not be said that the faith to which the privilege of justification is annexed is such a belief of the gospel, by the power of the Spirit, as leads us to Christ, to receive Christ, to trust in Christ, and to commit the keeping of our souls into His hands, in humble confidence of His ability and willingness to save us. (Matt. 11:28; John 1:12; Eph. 1:12; II. Tim. 1:12)

4. Peace. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:1).

Peace arises from a sense of reconciliation. God promises to par-

don, to receive into His favor, and to save all who repent and believe the gospel. The sinner appropriates these promises by faith and this brings peace to his conscience. It is denominated perfect. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee" (Isa. 26:3). It is inexpressibly great, "And the peace of God which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7). This peace may, however, be weak or strong according as our faith may be weak or strong. The Scriptures speak often in words of encouragement and consolation to those of weak faith (Rom. 14:1; Rom. 15:1; I.Cor. 9:22). There is a real difference between the strong believer and the weak, or rather, I should say, between the believer who exercises strong faith, and the believer who has a weak faith, but while the privileges and security of the former are much greater than the latter yet the latter is safe. A child can hold a staff as well, though not to strongly, as a man. The poor man's "I believe" saved him; though he was fain to add, "Lord, help my unbelief." Our Saviour compares Himself to the brazen serpent, raised by Moses in the wilderness, and the believing christian stung with the sting of sin to the Israelites who looked on it to the end that they might be cured (John 3:14). Now we know that all the Israelites that were stung by the deadly serpents could not see equally well. But all who obeyed and looked were cured, however imperfect the vision, to show that they were not cured because of the strength of their vision, but because of the object of their faith and obedience.

Diversity of degrees in the quantity of a thing does not annihilate the existence and true being of the thing itself. A small drop of water is as truly water as the Atlantic Ocean. A little spark is as truly fire, both as to substance and quality, as well as a conflagration. A little child is as truly a person as a giant. So a little faith is as truly faith as a full persuasion.

ASSURANCE.

To make assurance of personal salvation essential to faith, as some

do, is contrary to Scripture and to the experience of God's people. At the same time, Scripture and experience teach that assurance is not only attainable, but a privilege and a duty. Where there is true faith, the lack of assurance is to be attributed to the weakness of faith or to erroneous views of the plan of salvation. Many believers are too introspective. They look too exclusively within, so that their hope is graduated by the degree of evidence of regeneration which they find in their own experience. This, except in rare cases, can never lead to the assurance of hope. We may examine our hearts with microscopic care and never be satisfied that we have eliminated every ground of misgiving and doubt. The grounds of assurance are not so much within us, as without. They are, according to Scripture, (1) The universal and unconditional promise of God that those who come to Him in Christ, He will in no wise cast out; that whosoever will may take of the water of life without money and without price. We are bound to be assured that God is faithful and will certainly save those who believe. (2) The infinite, immutable, and gratuitous love of God. In the first ten verses of the fifth chapter of Romans, and in the eighth chapter of the same epistle from the thirty-first verse to the end of the chapter, the Apostle dwells on these characteristics of God's love, as constituting an immovable foundation of the believer's hope. (3) The infinite merit of the satisfaction of Christ and the prevalence of His continued intercession. Paul especially emphasizes these points (Rom. 8:34). (4) From the witness of the Spirit, Paul says, "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God" because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost given unto us. That is, the Holy Ghost assures us that we are the objects of that love which goes on to describe as infinite, immutable and gratuitous. Again, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." If, therefore, any true believer lacks the assurance of faith, the fault is in himself and not in the plan of salvation, or in the promises of our Lord. No believer can read the Scriptures we here cite and believe them and then doubt the certainty

* [illegible]

[illegible] being justified by [illegible] we have [illegible]
[illegible] Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access [illegible]
[illegible] wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.
And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: [illegible]
that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience;
and experience hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because
the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost
which is given unto us. For when we were yet without strength, in
due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a right-
eous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some
would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love towards us
in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more
then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from
wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were recon-
ciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled
we shall be saved by His life. What shall we then say to these things
If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own
but delivered Him up for us all, how shall he not with Him also freely give
us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is
that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather
that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also
maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?
Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness
or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all
the long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay in all these
things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For
I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor prin-
cipalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor
height, nor depth, nor any other creature for created things [illegible]
[illegible] able to separate us from the love of God, which is in
Christ Jesus our Lord."

Attached
to page
176

of His salvation (John 3:16); (John 5:24);(John 6:51); (John 6:37-40); (John 10:27-28).

6. Obedience. True faith is never alone, but is joined with gospel-obedience. "As ye have received Christ so walk ye in Him. (Col. 2:6). He that would disjoin faith and obedience is like one who would walk with one foot, which is impossible. Faith and works, faith and holiness, are the two feet by which the christian walks -- makes his way to heaven. Paul and James do not contradict each other. An unhappy division has been made by others between faith and works. Though in my intellect I may divide them, just as in the candle I know there is both light and heat, but put out the candle and they are both gone; one cannot exist without the other. What promotes one, promotes the other. "By grace are ye saved,through faith, and that not of yourself, it is the gift of God." The pronoun "that " does not refer to faith, but to salvation by grace. The grace of God, the pardon, and sympathy and help of God, is God's free gift; it is nothing that we earned or merited, it is a gratuity; but the faith that appropriates the gift is not any part of the gift. God does not give us faith; but He gives us salvation through faith, but we ourselves must believe Salvation is a gift from God -- a "free gift." But a gift is not a gift until it is accepted. That which is forced upon another without his consent is not a gift, it is an imposition. The word gift implies two persons, one of whom is free either to bestow it, or to withhold it; the other of whom is free to accept it, or to reject it. The act of accepting salvation is surely man's act, and that act is faith. The free act of God in bestowing salvation is grace; the free act of man in accepting it is faith.

Chapter XVII.

REGENERATION.

The Greek word palingenesia - "re-creation," "making new," is found only twice in the Scriptures. In (Matt. 19:28) it refers to the re-creation of the social order, and renewal of the earth, (Isa. 11:6-9; Rom. 8:19-23). In (Titus 3:5) it refers to the new birth of the believer. It is that work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart. It is expressed in Scripture by being born again (John 3:7); born from above; being quickened, (Eph. 2:1); Christ formed in the heart, (Gal.4:12); a partaking of the divine nature (II. Pet. 1:4); a new creature (II. Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15).

Regeneration, or "the new birth," is that great change which takes place when God raises the soul from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. The change wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit when it is created anew in Christ, and renewed after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness. "It is that entire change of our moral nature which is effected by the Spirit of God, through the word received by faith, when the corrupt and fallen nature which we inherited from Adam is taken away, and the holy and spiritual nature which we receive from Christ is imparted." (John Angell James).

1. The necessity for such a change. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." It is carnal, corrupt, depraved, sinful; for in this sense the term "flesh," as it is opposed to "spirit" is to be interpreted in the Bible (Rom. 8:5-8; Gal. 5:17). The understanding darkened (I. Cor. 2:14; Eph. 4:18); the heart is at enmity, (Rom. 8:7); the will is perverse (John 5:40; Matt. 23:37); the affections are earthly (Rom. 8:5); and by nature the children of wrath and under Satan (Eph. 2:2-3). In this state we are born into the world -- born in sin, and having been "born in sin," we must be "born again;" the fleshly principle must die; and born from above -- born of the Spirit -- the spiritual principle will be restored to its proper supremacy and power, thus allying us to God, and enrolling us among the subjects of a spiritual kingdom.

2. The necessity of this spiritual birth will appear when we consider the purity of heaven, its society, its exercises, and enjoyments. In our natural state we are unfit entirely for these. Without the change the Spirit makes we cannot see, much less enter the kingdom (John 3:3-5; Matt.5:8; Heb. 12:14; Rev. 21:27).

3. The Author of the new creation is God. This is the uniform testimony of the Bible, (John 3:5-6; II. Cor. 3:18; Titus 3:5). This does not, however, mean that the sinner himself is wholly inactive. God neither forces the human will, nor saves man without his consent, and co-operation. There is a sense in which he is to work out his own salvation (Phil. 2:12), to make himself a new heart and a new spirit, (Ezek. 18:31). What is divinely commanded must be possible. A certain power of compliance is put within every one of us. At the same time, if man were not favored with the enlightening and transforming power of the Holy Ghost, all personal efforts and all forms of instrumentality would be in vain; or rather no personal effort would be made. The Holy Spirit imparts a measure of light, excites spiritual desires, and invites to salvation. Then, if His gracious influences are yielded to, He bestows them more abundantly -- gives grace for grace. If still obeyed, He imparts further help; and the penitent fully resigning himself to Christ by faith, He takes up His abode in his heart, sheds abroad His love therein, and thus the soul is regenerated.

4. The instrumental means by which the Holy Spirit operates in effecting this life-giving change is the Word of God -- the sword of the Spirit. Some have contended that the Spirit operates directly upon the affections and the will. But the Scriptures teach that He works upon the heart through the medium of "the truth" -- the word of divine truth contained in the gospel (James 1:18; I. Pet. 1:23; I. Cor. 4:15; Rom. 10:17: Eph. 5:26). And there never will, perhaps, occur a single instance of regeneration in which the word of God, in one form of administration or another, will not be the instrument employed. What mighty force is thus given the exhortation of the apostle James, "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, etc.;" and of

Paul, "Preach the word, etc."

4. It is an instantaneous act, for there can be no medium between life and death, and occurs simultaneously with justification and the witness of the Spirit. The succession in the order of thought is this. Justification, or the relative change, with immediate adoption into the family of God, the Spirit is then given to bear His witness to the heart that sin is forgiven and the prodigal welcomed to his Father's house. And from that witness, and the consciousness of divine love which it awakens, there springs up in the heart that love to God which is the great principle in our regeneration (I. John 4:19). This is, as we see it, the order of our spiritual recovery, and hence we see the harmony which exists between the blessings; the witness of the Spirit being the keystone -- or the link which binds together the relative and the real change. Justification and regeneration are distinguished thus: Justification implies only a relative, regeneration a real, change. God, in justifying us, does something for us; in begetting us again, He does the work in us. The former changes our outward relation to God, so that of aliens we become children, by the latter our inmost souls are changed, so that of sinners we become saints. The one restores us to the favor, the other to the image of God. The one is the taking away the guilt, the other the taking away the power of sin; so that though they are joined together in the point of time, yet they are of wholly distinct natures.

Let us look a little at what is meant by immediate or instantaneous regeneration. It is not meant that the preparatory steps, which consist in the infusion of knowledge, and all those influences which go to form, if not the element, yet the vehicles, of moral power, are instantaneous. On the contrary, experience teaches -- and Scripture corroborates it -- that the state of preparation for change may admit of any amount of gradualness. There may be a long series of ameliorations, there may be the wasting of prejudices, there may be the supplanting of ignorance by better views, there may be an increase of sensibility to that which is right and pure, there may be a greater conformity of conduct to right rules and principles, there may be an in-

finite number of minute and gradual unfolding processes preliminary to the great change.

You are traveling in a given direction, and you at first have a faint perplexing feeling, "I am afraid I have the wrong road;" but you go on, and the feeling grows on you, and evidences increase, and you walk slower, and are more irresolute, till by and by the conviction flashes on you, "I am wrong!" and you turn about and go the other way. There is an instant in which you stop, although it may be preceded by hours of thought, and a growing tendency to change; and when a man changes from going in a wrong direction to going in a right, there is an instant in which he turns. It is so in moral and religious affairs. There is an instant in which everything begins. Therefore regeneration is in an instant: so that the instant before a man arrives at this state it could not be said that he is regenerate; and the instant after he is in this state, it cannot be denied he is regenerate. When a man changes from the power of supreme selfishness to the power of supreme love, from the service of the devil and the world to the service of God, the change is instantaneous, though the causes leading to it may be gradual.

5. Baptismal regeneration. While there is no Scripture, when properly interpreted, to support this theory, yet this is the avowed teaching of the Roman Catholic church, the Campbellites, and Tractarians. The Liturgy of the Church of England in the baptism of infants proceeds on this supposition that this doctrine is true. It is not believed or taught by the great body of evangelical protestants.

It is disproved by Scripture facts. There are instances of persons being regenerated who had not been baptized, the thief on the cross, and Cornelius. There are also instances of persons being baptized who were not regenerated, Simon Magus, Ananias and Sapphira.

Paul evidently did not believe that regeneration and water baptism were identified for he gloried in preaching, but not in baptism.

"I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, Etc," (I. Cor. 1:14-17). We feel confident that Paul and the other apostles did not teach that regeneration was in the act of water baptism. And is it not an undeniable and melancholy fact that thousands, who have embraced this delusion, have in life demonstrated but too clearly that while they have been baptized with water have never been baptized with the Holy Ghost?

CHAPTER XVIII.

ADOPTION.

Adoption is a word taken from civil law, and was much in use in the time of Paul. It was a custom for persons who had no children and were possessed of an estate to make choice of such orphan children as were agreeable to them, whom they took into the legal relation of children; requiring them to take their name, and to pay respect to them as though they were their natural parents, and engaging to deal with them as though they had been so; and accordingly to give them a right to their estate as an inheritance. This new relation, founded in mutual consent, is a bond of affection and trust; and the privilege arising is, that he, who is in this sense a father, takes care of and provides for those whom he adopts as if they were his own children by nature.

It is easy, then, to see the propriety of the term as used by Paul, in reference to this act, though it is evident that there is some difference between civil and spiritual adoption. Civil adoption was allowed of and provided for the relief and comfort of those who had no children; but in spiritual adoption this reason does not appear. The Almighty was under no obligation to do this; for He had innumerable spirits whom He had created, who had all the perfections of the divine nature, who was the object of His delight, and who is styled the heir of all things. (Heb. 1:2-3). When men adopt, it is on account of some excellency in the persons who are adopted; thus Pharaoh's daughter adopted Moses because he was exceeding fair, (Acts 7:20-21); and Mordecai adopted Esther because she was his uncle's daughter, and was fair and beautiful (Est. 2:7); but man by nature has nothing in him to merit this divine act (Ezek. 16:5). In civil adoption, though the name of a son be given, the nature of a son cannot; this relation may not necessarily be attended with any change of dispotition or character. But in spiritual adoption we are made partakers of the divine nature and a disposition given us becoming the relationship we bear (Jer. 3:19).

Much has been written as to the time of adoption. Some place it before regeneration, because it is supposed we must be in the family before we can partake of the blessings of the family. But it is difficult to conceive of one before the other; for although adoption may seem to precede regeneration in order of nature, yet not of time; they may be distinguished, not ~~not~~ separated. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on His name." (John 1:12). Adoption is not a mere relation, it is a privilege, and the privilege and the image go together. A state of adoption is never without a separation from defilement. (II. Cor. 6:17-18). The new name in adoption is never given till the new creature be formed. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," (Rom. 8:14). Yet they are to be distinguished. Regeneration, as a physical act, gives us a likeness to God in our nature; adoption, as a legal act, gives us a right to an inheritance. Regeneration makes us formally His sons, by conveying a principle (I. Pet. 1:23); adoption makes us relatively His sons by conveying a power (John 1:12). By the one we are instated in the divine affection, by the other we are partakers of the divine nature.

But can the believer be assured of his adoption? The Scriptures assert repeatedly that such assurance is attainable. They abound with examples of those who have lived in the enjoyment of it. Under the patriarchal dispensation there was Abel (Heb. 11:4); Enoch (Heb. 11:5); and Job (Job 19:25). Under the Jewish dispensation there was David (Ps. 103:1-2-5). Isaiah (Chap. 6:7); and Daniel (chap. 9:23). And in the dispensation of the gospel "the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sin" is one of the distinguishing features of the new life. Our Lord was anointed "to comfort all that mourn" (Isa. 61:1-3). He honored continually the faith of the humble by assurance of forgiving mercy (Matt. 9:2; Luke 7:47-48; Luke 10:20). He has provided for His church "another Comforter," whose perpetual work it is to testify to the adoption of His believing people (Rom. 8:15). The con-

verts in Apostolic times showed by the gladness they felt that they knew that they were of God. The Pentecostal believers (Acts 2:46); the Ethiopian (Acts (8:36); the jailer (Acts 16:45). Paul always assumes that those to whom he wrote knew themselves to be forgiven; otherwise his descriptions of their character would be false, and his admonitions altogether inapplicable (Rom. 5:11; II. Cor. 13:11; Phil. 3:1; Phil. 4:4; I. Thess. 5:16-18).

The assurance of our spiritual sonship is attained by a twofold witness, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). First, that of "the Spirit itself," or rather the same Spirit (auto to pneuma) of which the Apostle had spoken in the foregoing verses; "the Spirit of Christ," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of adoption." Secondly, that of "our spirit" -- our true self, the spiritual, intelligent, accountable, and deathless part of our nature. There is a <u>conjoint</u> testimony of these two witnesses. "The Spirit itself" is a <u>fellow witness</u> "with our spirit." Such is the import of the Greek word <u>summarturei</u>, which is employed here.

"By the testimony of the Spirit, I mean an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God, that Jesus Christ hath loved me and given Himself for me, that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God." (John Wesley). These Scriptures refer to this testimony (Rom. 8:15-16; Gal. 4:6; I. Cor. 2:12; I. John 4:3). It is clearly implied in these also (Rom. 5:1-5; Rom. 8:1; Isa. 12:1-2).

The witness of our own spirit consists in our individual consciousness that we possess the <u>character</u> of the children of God, as that character is protrayed in God's word. It is nearly, if not exactly, the same with the testimony of a good conscience towards God, and is the result of reason and reflection on what we feel in our souls. Strictly speaking, it is a conclusion drawn partly from the Word of God, and partly from our own experience. The Word of God says that every one who has the fruit of

the Spirit is a child of God; then, therefore, experience, or inward consciousness, tells us that we have the fruit of the Spirit, we rationally conclude we are children of God. These Scriptures sustain this view (II. Cor. 1:12; I. John 3:14-19; I. John 5:10). Now, as this witness proceeds from the Spirit of God, and is grounded on what He works in us, it is sometimes called the Spirit's indirect witness, to distinguish it from the other testimony, which is properly direct.

It is important to be able to distinguish between this testimony of the Holy Spirit, and the impressions of an excited imagination and from the delusions of Satan. There are certain marks that determine this:-

1. The testimony of the Holy Ghost is always preceded by hearty, genuine repentance. Its consolations are unknown until the spirit of man has been humbled and is contrite; till iniquity has been abandoned, and the cry extorted, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." But with this deep and penitent humiliation of heart presumption is not acquainted. And we therefore press this inquiry upon all who think they have the Spirit of God, have you felt a godly sorrow for sin -- sorrow that has led you to hate it as the worst of evils, and to put forth every power in forsaking its practice? If the believer has, the Spirit Who is leading him will not suffer him to be deceived; but if he have not, the cry Abba, Father, is from no divine testimony. He is saying peace, when there is no peace. He is yet in the bonds of iniquity.

2. Where the Holy Spirit bears His witness, He invariably produces a godly character. The Holy Spirit is the believer's indwelling parakletos, (one called alongside to help) to help his ignorance and infirmity and to make intercession for him. The inward testimony causes to spring forth that beautiful cluster of christian graces which Paul calls "the fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. 5:22-23). Fruits like these are never produced by an unregenerate life, or a delusion. They grow nowhere but in a heart that has undergone the great renovating change. Where they are found, the witness

from above, and the witness from within, bear a united testimony, which may be received without suspicion and without fear.

3. The witness of the Spirit is a common privilege of believers. Many regard it as the privilege of the few, and not even to be granted to them until the close of life. But this notion has no countenance in Scripture. In Gal. 4:6, Paul makes it a part of "the common salvation" as truly as adoption itself. "Because ye are sons" -- not because you are singularly holy, or are come to hoary hairs, or are on the verge of the grave, but -- "because ye are sons God hath sent forth His son..... that ye might receive the adoption of sons." It is not a reward for good service, but a birthright, not a crown of distinction, but a joy of adoption. And every part of the New Testament makes the sense of adoption a near, present good, which babes in Christ may feel, and the meekest of earth may know, which is offered to the prodigal when he returns to his father's house, and to the publican when first justified from his sins. These passages addressed to believers of every age and rank sustain these views (Rom. 5:1-5; Rom. 8:15-16; I. Pet. 1:8-9). Besides these there is an almost endless variety of texts holding out to believers the promise of rest and peace (Matt. 11:28; John 15:26-27; Rom. 14:17 etc.). And can the enjoyment of rest and peace, such as that which is here described, co-exist with doubt and misgiving as to our acceptance in the Beloved? No, it can arise from no influence but that of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who leads us and reveals to us the mercy and love of God in Christ Jesus. If these things are true, the sense of adoption is a common privilege of our common faith. In the heart now throbbing for the first time under the inspirations of spiritual life, there is the same cry as in the heart of the aged saint on whose face is falling the light of a better world than this. Each can say, Abba, Father, my Lord and my God.

But this full assurance of our adoption may be interrupted. And unless we learn to live by faith, and maintain diligence in christian duty it is impossible to retain it. Besides this there may be times of severe

and heavy trial; the mind may be depressed through bodily disorders, or be in heaviness through manifold temptations; and the great adversary may use all his skill to inject unbelieving thoughts. Under such circumstances it may be very difficult to retain the full assurance of faith, especially for one who is naturally of a despondent, or melancholy temperament. However, it is obviously the will of God that His children should "abide" in His love (John 15:9-10); should "rejoice in the Lord always" (Phil. 4:4; I. Thess.5:16) should "walk in the light" (Isa. 2:5; I. John 1:6-7); and should "joy in the God of salvation," even in seasons of greatest providential affliction (II. Cor. 6:10; Hab. 3:17-18).

As faith is the instrument by which we receive the Spirit's witness, the absence of that instrument, through mental depression, will, of course, be the occason of our being destitute of the witness of the Spirit. As mental depression affects our perceptions generally, it will doubtless affect our religious perceptions, and may so fix and concentrate the soul's attention on what is gloomy, as to create for itself a region of darkness in which it cannot see the benign features of God's character, or the mercy so brightly revealed in the gospel. Thus, though a mental infirmity obscuring our views, our confidence fails; and our confidence failing, our evidence fails also. Cases like these are to be regarded as evidences of mental disease, and not to be regarded as a standard for others whose minds are in a healthy state.

Reviewing the whole subject, we may say, none should ever presume to rest in any supposed testimony of the Spirit which is separate from the fruit of it. Nor should any one rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness. In our being favored with a two-fold testimony there is evidently great practical utility, as it is a protection against presumption on the one hand, and despondency on the other. Our gracious Father has placed a double guard around our spiritual and eternal interests. As He has provided that where one bodily sense mistakes an object, another sense may correct it; so in reference to the important matter of personal salvation --

its evidence is placed both in our consciousness of the Spirit's witness, and the conviction of our own judgment. The one is the echo of the other, responding to the same blessed testimony. What 'the Spirit itself' makes evident to our consciousness, 'our spirit' makes evident to our reason. What the former reveals by an immediate impression, the latter demonstrates by inference and argument; both unite in declaring that now are we the sons of God.

CHAPTER XIX.

SANCTIFICATION.

Christianity finds man not, to be sure, just as God made him, but as God made him and as sin has spoiled him. It finds man with a certain mental and moral constitution, not in its normal state, but very much decayed by his own sin and the sins of his forefathers, back to the first sin of the first sinner. Christianity proposes to place him under such influences as shall bring him to right-mindedness. It is not a mechanical restraint; it is a constitutional cure. It does not work from without; it works from within. It is not a destroyer; it is a rectifier. Because the fine instrument of the soul is out of tune, Christianity does not propose to tear all its strings away; it rather proposes to "tune" this wonderful instrument, and bring it into accord with the sure and certain harmonies of the angelic hosts. There is not a faculty, appetite, passion, or power of body, mind, or soul, which has not been injured by sin; but there is not one which is useless or injurious to man; and consequently, if Christianity be a blessing, it will seek to break none of these down, but to purge away the influence of sin; to adjust, rectify, harmonize, purify and strengthen all these human powers. Hence the burden of the gospel is "Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."

The Scriptures of the Old Testament, as well as the New, set forth in plain language God's method of cleansing and setting apart both persons and things for His service. In the Old Testament the words consecration, dedication, sanctification, and holiness are various renderings of one Hebrew word *qodesh*, it signifies "set apart for God." Only when used of God Himself as in (Lev. 11:45) or of the holy angels as in (Dan. 4:13) is any inward moral quality necessarily implied. Doubtless a priest, or other person set apart to the service of God, whose whole will and desire went with his setting apart, experienced progressively an inner detachment from evil. In the New Testament one Greek word *hagios*, in its various forms is rendered "holy,"

"holiness","sanctify," "sanctified," "sanctification," and , like the Hebrew word before given, signifies "set apart for God." Throughout the Scriptures, the thoughtful reader cannot have failed to notice the constant intermixture of two distinct classes of words, namely, "saint," "sanctify," "sanctification." This class of words with the addition of the word "sanctuary" was borrowed by our translators from the old Latin version of the Scriptures. The other class, namely, "holy," "hallow," "holiness," are words of Anglo-Saxon derivation, all having to do with perfection in some of its most important relations. Besides these two classes are the words - hale, hallow, heal, health, whole. These all come from the Anglo-Saxon hal meaning whole, in the sense of complete, entire, perfect. There are also their near relatives, "dedicated," which is sometimes used instead of "holy," also "consecrated," "dedication," and "consecration," which express substantially the same ideas as "sanctification." The radical meaning which gives their distinctive signification to all these words is, separation to God to be His wholly and inviolably for His service and glory. It is assumed that the fundamental relation of all things is to God; that man especially is His, and that only in that relation and service can all attain the end and measure of their being. A "saint" is one whom God has separated to Himself, and who has dedicated himself to God. Such an one is no longer his own, nor may he be the servant of men, except in so far as the service of men lies within the sphere of the larger service of God. (I. Cor. 3:16-17; I. Cor. 6:19-20, also I. Cor. 7:23).

The supreme work of God in man's salvation is His glory. That is the revelation of His character, with its manifold attributes, and by this revelation, and as a means of completing it, to completely develop in man the divine image in which, as the crowning work of creation, he was created at the first. The method of restoring the divine image is given in the gospel. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." The

sin that destroyed this image must be washed away before this image can be restored. In justification and regeneration we have seen how God begins this work. We must remember that His work is always complete. When He forgives our sins He forgives all. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." His work is never incomplete. His plan of redemption is complete, and His method of saving from the power and dominion of sin, and of keeping us and finally presenting His redeemed unto Himself is complete, "Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. (Eph. 5:25-26-27).

(Continued next page)

Sanctification is that work of divine grace by which we are renewed after the image of God - set apart for His service, and enabled to die unto sin and live unto righteousness. It is a maturity of holy love -- love which counteracts and expels all unholy influences, and moulds the soul into the image of God; for "God is love."

We count these things perfect which want nothing requisite for the end whereunto they were instituted. Accordingly, a man may be said to be perfect who answers the end for which God made him; and as God requires every man to love Him with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself, then he that does so is a perfect man -- he answers the end for which God made him. And this is more evident from the nature of that love which fills his heart; for, as love is the principle of obedience, so he that loves his God with all his powers will obey Him with all his powers; and he who loves his neighbor as himself will not only do no injury to him, but on the contrary, labor to promote his welfare. This is perfect love, the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:9-10). This state of grace is what we understand to be a state of holiness, or sanctification, or, as some call it, christian perfection.

We may consider it in several respects:-

1. As an inestimable privilege granted us from God. (I. Thess. 5:23).

2. As an all-comprehensive duty required of us all by the gospel (I. Thess. 4:3).

Sanctification is distinguished from justification thus: Justification changes our state in law before God as Judge; sanctification changes our heart and life before Him as our Father. From justification arises our title to heaven, from sanctification arises our meetness for it. Justification removes the guilt of sin, sanctification the power of it. Justification precedes, sanctification follows as the fruit and evidence of it. Justification is an act done at once, sanctification is a work that is gradual and may continue till death. (Prov. 4:18; Rev. 2:10; I. Pet. 5:4). Holiness of charac-

ter is not a thing into which we can jump in a moment, and just when we please. It cannot be attained without great effort, watchfulness, much prayer, and a very close walk with God. Like the coral reef which grows by little daily additions until it is strong enough to resist the mighty waves of the ocean, so is a holy character made up of what may be called littles, though in truth each of those littles is of vast importance. Little duties prayerfully discharged; little temptations earnestly resisted in the strength which God supplies out of the fullness which He has made to dwell in Jesus Christ for His people; little sins avoided or crucified, little acts of love and little words of cheer, -- these all together help to form that beautiful character that is holy. We begin God's service because He calls us to it, we end by loving the service for its own sake. And this is an advanced stage of the divine life. It implies a great likeness to God who does that which is good, not from any outward obligation, but from the free and unalterable propensity of His eternal nature towards that which is good. We thus cease to be servants, and grow into the life and liberty of sons. Our obedience to God has brought us in happy advances towards His presence. We have been doing the will of the Father, and the consequence is, that our own will has become identified with His. Inclination and duty now go hand in hand. The sense of bondage has disappeared, and a sweet sense of free choice has come in its place. We have learned what it is to be holy as God is holy. By serving Him we have found our fruit unto holiness. Holiness is meant, our New Testament tells us, for every day use. It is home-made and home-worn. Its exercise hardens the bone, and strengthens the muscle in the body of character. Holiness is religion shining. It is the candle lighted, and not hid under a bushel, but lighting the house. It is religious principle put into motion. It is the love of God sent forth into circulation, on the feet, and with the hands, of love to man. It is faith gone to work. It is charity coined into actions and devotion breathing benedictions on human suffering while it goes up in intercessions to our Father in heaven.

Sanctification is a supernatural work. The word supernatural is

used in two different senses. First, for that which is above nature, and by nature is meant everything out of God. An effect, therefore, is said to be supernatural, in the production of which nature exercises no efficiency. But secondly, the word is often used to mark the distinction between the providential efficiency of God operating according to fixed laws, and the voluntary agency of the Holy Spirit. In the latter sense of the word supernatural, the co-operation of second causes is not excluded. When Christ opened the eyes of the blind no second cause interposed between His volition and the effect. This represents the first. But men work out their own salvation, while it is God who worketh in them to will and to do according to His own good pleasure. This represents the second use of the word supernatural. Again, in regeneration the soul is passive. It cannot co-operate in the communication of spiritual life. But in repentance, conversion, faith, and growth in grace all the powers of the soul are called into exercise. As, however, the effects produced transcend the efficiency of our fallen nature and are due to the agency of the Spirit, sanctification does not cease to be supernatural, or a work of grace, because the soul is active and co-operating in the process.

That sanctification is a supernatural work in the sense above stated is proved, -

1. From the fact that it is constantly referred to God as its author. It is referred to God absolutely, or to the Father, as in I. Thess. 5:23, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly." Heb. 13:20-21, "The God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus.....make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight." It is also referred to the Son as in Titus 2:14: He "gave Himself for us, that He might .....purify unto Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Eph. 5:25, He "loved the church and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it, etc."

Predominantly sanctification is referred to the Holy Spirit, as His peculiar work in the economy of Redemption. Hence He is called the

Spirit of all grace; the Spirit of joy, of peace, of love, of faith, and of adoption. All christian graces are set forth as the fruits of the Spirit. We are said to be born of the Spirit, and by Him to be enlightened, taught, led, and cleansed. We are said to be in the Spirit, to live, to walk, and to rejoice in the Spirit. The Spirit dwells in the people of God, and is the abiding source of all the actings of that spiritual life which He implants in the soul. The Scriptures teach that the Son and Spirit are in the Holy Trinity subordinate to the Father, as to their mode of subsistence and operation, although the same in substance and equal in power and glory. Hence it is that the same work is often attributed to the Father, to the Son, and to the Spirit; and as the Father and the Son operate through the Spirit, the effects due to the agency of God are referred specially to the Holy Spirit.

This reference of sanctification to God proves it to be a supernatural work, because the insufficiency of second causes to produce the effect is declared to be the ground of this reference. It is because men cannot cleanse or heal themselves, that they are declared to be cleansed and healed by God. It is because rites, ceremonies, sacraments, truth, moral suasion, cannot bring the soul back to God, that it is said to be transformed, by the renewing of the mind, through the power of the Spirit, into the image of God. We are, therefore, declared to be God's workmanship, created unto good works. And it is not we that live, but Christ that liveth in us.

The Scriptures recognize the free agency of man; they acknowledge and treat him as a moral and rational being: they admit the adaptation of truth to convince the understanding, and of the motives presented to determine the will and to control the affections, and nevertheless they teach that these secondary causes and influences are utterly ineffectual to the regeneration and sanctification of the soul, without the demonstration of the Spirit. The sacred writers, therefore, constantly pray for the divine influence to attend the means of grace and to render them effectual, as well for

sanctification as for regeneration and conversion. Every such prayer, every thanksgiving for grace imparted, every recognition of the christian virtues as fruits of the Spirit, and gifts of God, are so many recognitions of the great truth that the restoration of man to the image of God is not a work of nature, either originated or carried on by the efficiency of second causes, but is truly and properly supernatural, as due to the immediate power of the Spirit producing effects for which second causes are inadequate. Christ gives His own illustrations of this truth, the wisest, profoundest, and most beautiful, "I am the vine, ye are the branches ..... As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in Me." "Apart from Me ye can do nothing."

2. <u>In what does sanctification consist?</u>

Admitting it to be a supernatural work the question still remains, In what does it consist, and what is the nature of the effect produced? The truth that lies at the foundation of all the Scriptural representations of this subject is, that regeneration, of which believers are the subject, while it involves the implanting, or communication of a new principle or form of life, does not effect the immediate and entire deliverance of the soul from sin. A man raised from the dead may be and long continue to be, in a very feeble, diseased, and suffering state. So the soul by nature dead in sin, may be quickened together with Christ, and thereby not be rendered perfect. The principle of life may be very feeble, it may have in the soul much that is uncongenial with its nature, and the conflict between the old and the new life may be protracted and painful. Such not only may be, but such in fact is the case in all the ordinary experience of the people of God. Here we find one of the characteristic and far-reaching differences between the Roman Catholic church and all Protestant systems of doctrine. According to the Romish doctrine nothing of the nature of sin remains in the soul after baptism. From this the teaching of the church of Rome deduces its doctrine of the merit of good works, of perfection, of works of supererogation, and indirectly those of ~~ABO~~ ablution and indulgences. But according to the Scrip-

tures, the universal experience of believers, and the undeniable evidence of history, regeneration does not remove all sin. The Bible is filled with the record of the inward conflicts of the most eminent of God's children, with their falls, their backslidings, their repentings and their sorrows over their continued shortcomings. And not only this, but the nature of the conflict between good and evil in the heart of the renewed is fully described, the contending principles are distinguished and designated, and the necessity, difficulties, and perils of the struggle, as well as the method of properly sustaining it, are set forth in the Bible, repeatedly and in detail. In the seventh chapter of Romans we have an account of this conflict elaborately described by Paul as drawn from his own experience. See the same in Gal. 5:16-17. "This I say then, walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." See also Eph. 6:10-18; Rom. 7:22-23).

With the teaching of Scripture the experience of all christians in all ages agrees. Their writings are filled with the account of their struggles with the remains of sin in their own hearts; with confessions, with prayers for divine aid, and with longings after a final victory. And what the Bible and the experience of believers prove to be true, history puts beyond dispute.

Such being the foundation of the Scriptural representations concerning sanctification, its nature is thereby determined. As all men since the fall are in a state of sin, not only sinners because of specific acts of transgression, but also as depraved, their nature perverted and corrupted, regeneration is the infusion of a new principle of life in this corrupt nature. It is leven introduced to diffuse its influence gradually through the mass. Sanctification, therefore, consists in two things: first the removing more and more the principles of evil still infecting our nature, and destroying their power; and secondly, the growth of the principle of spiritual life until

it controls the thoughts, feelings, and acts, and brings the soul into conformity to the image of Christ.

3. The method of sanctification.

It has already been shown that sanctification does not exclude all human co-operation, but on the contrary, calls for the unremitting and most earnest efforts of our nature; it is, nevertheless, the work of God. The Bible is full of exhortations and commands addressed to the people of God, to those recognized and assumed to be regenerate, requiring them, on the one hand, to resist their evil passions and propensities, to lay aside all malice, and wrath, and pride, and jealousy, and envy; and on the other, to cultivate all the graces of the Spirit, faith, love, hope, longsuffering, meekness, lowliness of mind, and brotherly kindness. At the same time they are reminded that it is God who worketh in them both to will and do His good pleasure, and that therefore they are to constantly seek His aid. This view is, we believe, consistent with the account given in the Bible of the way in which this great change of character is carried on and consumated.

4. The Bible teaches how a soul by nature spiritually dead, being quickened by the mighty power of God, is gradually transformed into the image of Christ, is substantially as follows.

(1) It is led to exercise faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, to receive Him as its Saviour, committing itself to Him to be by His grace delivered from the guilt and power of sin. This is the first step and secures all the rest, because according to the plan of salvation, which God has revealed and which He has pledged Himself to carry out, He becomes bound by His promise to accomplish the full salvation from sin ov every one who believes.

(2) The soul by this act of faith becomes united to Christ. We are in Him by faith. The consequences are (a) Participation in His merits. His perfect righteousness is imputed to the believer. He is thereby justified. He is introduced into a state of grace, and rejoices in hope of the

glory of God, (Rom. 5:1-3). This is, as the Scriptures teach, the essential preliminary condition of sanctification. While under the law we are under the curse. While under the curse we are the enemies of God and bring forth fruit unto death. It is only when delivered from the law by the death of Christ, and united to Him by faith that we bring forth fruit unto God (Rom. 6:8 and Rom. 7:4-6). Sin, therefore, shall not reign over us, Paul tells us, because we are not under the law (Rom. 6:14). Deliverance from the law is the necessary condition of deliverance from sin. All the relations of the believer are thus changed. He is translated from the kingdom of darkness and introduced into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Instead of being an outcast, or an alien, he is now a fellow-citizen with the saints and of the household of God, and shares in the love, tenderness, and care of our Heavenly Father. He is a new creature, a child of God, and as by natural birth the child has within it, at birth, all the elements necessary, to the development of a complete manhood, so in the spiritual birth the child of God has within all the elements needed for the complete man in Christ. (b) Another consequence of the union with Christ affected by faith, is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Christ has redeemed from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us, in order that we might receive the promise of the Holy Ghost, (Gal. 3:13-14). It was not consistent with the perfections of God that the Holy Spirit should be given to dwell with His saving influences in sinful men, until Christ had made a full satisfaction for the sins of the world. But as there are with God no distinctions of time, Christ was slain from the foundation of the world. and His death availed as fully for the salvation of those who lived before, as for that of those who have lived since His coming in the flesh (Rom. 5:25-26; Heb. 9:15). The Spirit was given to the people of God from the beginning. But, as Christ says (John 10:10) that He came into the world not only that men might have life, but that they might have it more abundantly, the effusion, or copious communication of the Spirit is always represented as the chief characteristic of the Messiah's advent (Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:16-21; John 7:38-39). Our Lord in His last discourse to His disciples

the Spirit "to enlighten the eyes of the understanding" (Eph. 1:18), that we may know the things freely given to us of God (I. Cor. 2:12): that is, the things which God has revealed; or as they are called in (I. Cor. 5:14), "The things of the Spirit of God." These things, which the natural man cannot know, the Spirit enables the believer to discern - to apprehend in their truth and excellence; and thus to experience their power. The Spirit, we are taught, especially opens the eyes to see the glory of Christ, to see that He is God manifest in the flesh; to discern not only His divine perfections, but His love to us, and His suitableness in all respects as our Saviour, so that those who have not seen Him, yet believing on Him, rejoice in Him with joy unspeakable and full of glory. This apprehension of Christ is transforming; the soul is thereby changed into His image, from glory to glory by the Spirit of the Lord.

The Spirit enables him to see also the glory of God as revealed in His works and in His word; the holiness and spirituality of the law; the exceeding sinfulness of sin; his own guilt, pollution and helplessness, the length and breadth, the height and depth of the economy of redemption; and the reality, glory, and infinite importance of the things unseen and eternal. The soul is thus raised above the world. It lives in a higher sphere. It becomes more and more heavenly in its character and desires. All the great doctrines of the Bible concerning God, Christ, and things spiritual and eternal, are so revealed by this inward teaching of the Spirit, as to be not only rightly discerned, but to exert, in a measure, their proper influence on the heart and life. Thus the prayer of our Lord (John 17:17), "Sanctify them through thy truth," is answered in the experience of His disciples.

(4) The work of sanctification is carried on by God's giving occasion for the exercise of all the graces of the Spirit. Submission, confidence, patience, self-denial, and meekness, as well as faith, hope, and love, are called forth, or put to the test, more or less effectually every day the believer lives on earth. And by this constant exercise of these

graces he grows in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is, however, principally by calling His people to labour and suffer for the advancement of His Kingdom, and for the good of their fellow-men, that this salutary discipline is carried on. The best christians generally are those, who from love to Christ and zeal for His glory, labour most and suffer most in His service.

(5) The Church and its ordinances aid in our sanctification. One great end for the establishment of the church on earth, as the communion of saints, is the edification of God's people. The social and intellectual life of man is not developed in solitude and isolation. It is only in contact and collision with his fellow-men that his powers are called into exercise and his social virtues are cultivated. Thus also it is by the church life of believers, by their communion in the worship and service of God, and by their mutual good offices and fellowship, that the spiritual life of the soul is developed. Therefore the exhortation, "Let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching, (Heb. 10:24-25). The Spirit renders the ordinances of God's house, the preached word, the sacraments, and prayer, effectual means of promoting the sanctification of believers, and securing their ultimate salvation.

Whenever the christian feels his weakness either in resisting temptation or in the discharge of duty, he looks to Christ and seeks aid from Him. When we fail, it is either from self-confidence, or from neglecting to call upon our ever present and almighty King, who is always ready to protect and deliver those who put their trust in Him. But there are dangers which we do not apprehend, enemies whom we do not see, and to which we would become an easy prey, were it not for the watchful care of Him who came into the world to destroy the works of the devil. Enemies have we both inward and outward, both seen and unseen; they are the world, the flesh, and the devil.

The ability of the believer to resist these enemies is not his own. He is strong only in the Lord and in the power of His might. (Eph. 6:10) The christian runs his race "Looking unto Jesus;" the life he lives, he lives by faith in the Son of God; it is by the constant worship of Christ; by the constant exercise of love towards Him; by constant endeavors to do His will; and by constantly looking to Him for the supply of grace and for aid and protection he overcomes sin and finally attains the prize of the high calling of God, and realizes that his life is hid with Christ in God.

There is, as we have seen, a gradual growth in the christian life. Hence the command (2 Pet. 3:18), and the similitudes by which Christ illustrated the work of grace; it is leaven (Matt. 13:33), this shows the royalty of the principles of the Kingdom of God. The chemical action of the leaven transforms every particle of the meal until the whole is changed into a new substance. The grace of God transforms men -- makes new creatures; it is like a grain of mustard seed, or grain of corn, (Matt. 13:31), (Mar. 4:26-29); it is the mortification of sin (Col. 3:5); it is rising from infancy to manhood (I. John 2:12-13); it is a race, "a going on" (Heb. 6:1 and 12:1). When the work is complete the believer is ready for a blessed transition to his home in heaven.

6. There are other views, differing in some particulars from those here given, but we have endeavored to present as faithfully as possible the teaching of the Bible as the position held by the Christian Church. Those who believe in <u>instantaneous</u> sanctification, and profess to have experienced this blessing admit that while we remain in the body we are liable to be imposed upon by deceptive appearances, to arrive at false conclusions; to be misled by unfaithful memory, illusory observations, erratic imaginations; to form unauthorized surmises and suspicions; to entertain incorrect opinions about many things. Mr. Wesley says "A thousand such instances there may be, even in those who are in the highest state of grace."

7. <u>The Fruits of Sanctification.</u>-

The fruits of sanctification are good works. "A good tree bring-

eth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, ~~neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit~~, For every tree is known by his own fruit; for of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes." (Luke 6:43-44). By good works, in this connection, are meant not only the inward exercises of the religious life, but also outward acts, such as can be seen and appreciated by others.

There are three senses in which works may be called good. (1) When as to the matter of them they are what the law prescribes. In this sense even the heathen perform good works (Rom. 2:14). "The Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law." That is they perform acts of justice and mercy. All men may do this, none too low but may do such acts. (2) A work is good when there is nothing in the agent or the act which the law condemns. In this sense not even the works of the holiest of God's people are good. No man is ever, since the fall, in this life, in such an inward state that he could stand before God and be accepted on the ground of what he is or what he does. All our righteousness is as filthy rags. (Isa. 64:6). (3) Although no work even of the true people of God, while in this world, is absolutely perfect, nevertheless those inward exercises and outward acts which are the fruits of the Spirit are properly designated good, and are so called in the Bible. Acts 9:36, it was said of Dorcas that she "was full of good works." Eph. 2:10, believers are said to be "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." 2 Tim. 3:17, teaches that the man of God should be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Titus 2:14, Christ gave Himself for us that He might "purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." There is no contradiction in pronouncing the same work good and bad, because good and bad are relative terms and the relations intended may be different. Feeding the poor, viewed in relation to the nature of the act, is a good work. Viewed in relation to the motive which prompted the act, it may be good or bad. If done to be seen of men, it is offensive to God. If done from natural benevolence, it is an act of ordinary morality. If done

to a disciple, in the name of a disciple, it is an act of christian virtue. The works of the children of God, although stained by evil, are truly and properly good, (B) because They are, as to their nature, commanded by God. (A) Because they are the fruits, as to the motive, not merely of right moral feeling, but of religious feeling, that is, love to God; and (C) Because they are performed with the purpose of complying with His will, of honoring Christ and of promoting the interests of His Kingdom.

The fundamental principle of Protestantism is that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice and no work can be regarded as good or obligatory on the conscience which the Scriptures do not enjoin. Of course it is not meant that the Bible commands in detail everything which the people of God are required to do, but it prescribes the principles by which their conduct is to be regulated and specifies the kind of acts which those principles require or forbid.

CHAPTER XX.

THE SACRAMENTS.

1. The word is derived from sacramentum, a term which means something sacred. Among the Romans it was applied to a deposit which was placed in the hands of a Pontifex by one who commenced a suit against another in a court of law and which forfeited was applied to sacred purposes.

The only safe and satisfactory method of arriving at the idea of a sacrament, in the christian sense of the word, is to take those ordinances which by common consent are admitted to be sacraments, and by analyzing them determine what are their essential elements or characteristics. We should then exclude all other ordinances in which those characteristics are not found. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are admitted to be sacraments. They are (1) Ordinances instituted by Christ. (2) They are in their nature significant, baptism of cleansing; the Lord's Supper of spiritual nourishment. (3) They were designed to be perpetual. (4) They were appointed to signify, and to instruct; to seal, and thus to confirm and strengthen; and to convey or apply and thus to sanctify, those who by faith receive them. These two sacraments instituted by Christ for the definite purpose of "signifying, sealing, and applying to believers," the benefits of redemption, stand alone in the New Testament. No other ordinance has the same characteristics or the same design.

Romanists, however, have seven sacraments, adding to baptism and the Lord's Supper, matrimony, orders, penance, confirmation, and extreme unction. According to the teaching of Romanists the individual is born in baptism; strengthened by confirmation; nourished by the Lord's Supper; recovered from spiritual illness by penance; the church is continued by holy matrimony; orders provides for supernaturally endowed teachers; and extreme unction prepares him for death.

Romanists have not even plausible ground for their appeal to common consent in support of their teaching on this subject. Protestants with few exceptions observe only two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

2. The necessity of observing these ordinances is obvious. No one would be willing to say, without qualification, that it is unnecessary to obey an explicit command of Christ. And as He has commanded His disciples to baptise all who are received as members of His church, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and required His disciples statedly to commemorate His death by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the strongest moral obligation rests on His people to obey these commands.

3. <u>The validity of the Sacraments.</u>

That is valid which avails for the end intended. The question, therefore, as to the validity of the sacraments is a question as to what is necessary to their being what they purport to be. The answer to this question is that they must conform to the prescriptions given in the Bible concerning them. The elements employed must be those which Christ ordained. The form, or the manner in which those elements are given and received must be in accordance with His directions; and the ordinance must be administered with the intention of doing what He has commanded. So if baptism be a washing with water, then it is necessary that water should be the element employed in its administration. If it be washing with water in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then these words, or that form, must be used; and the ordinance must be administered and received in the faith of the Trinity. Baptism is a christian ordinance. It involves on the part of both the administrator and the recipient the profession of the christian religion.

The other condition necessary to the validity of the sacraments concerns the intention of those engaged in the service. They must intend to do what Christ commanded. If a man receives the ordinance of baptism, he must intend to profess faith in the gospel, and to accept the terms of salvation therein presented. And the administrator must have the purpose to initiate the recipient into the number of the professed followers of Christ. A sacrament administered, therefore, even to a proper subject and in due form, by an idiot, a heathen, or in sport, or in mockery, is utterly null and void.

The only question on which there is much diversity of opinion on this subject, is, Whether the validity of the sacraments depends on the official standing of the person by whom they are administered? The Romanists make canonical ordination or consecration absolutely essential. No one except a bishop (in their sense of the term) can ordain or confirm. No one but a priest can administer an ordinance in the Romish church except baptism. Baptism is held by the Romish church to be essential to salvation, and as a priest is not always accessible baptism administered by a woman, layman, or a heathen is pronounced valid, provided the administrator intends to baptise.

Protestants generally place preaching the word and the administration of the sacraments on the same ground. They teach that Christ has appointed certain officers in the church; that by His Spirit He calls certain persons for the discharge of the duties of those offices; that those who aspire to them are to be examined as to their call and qualifications; that if found competent they are to be set apart or ordained in an orderly manner to the office to which they appear to be called; that the special functions of one class of those officers, are preaching and the administration of the sacraments. It follows from all this that for any one not thus called and set apart to undertake the exercise either of these functions of the ministry is irregular and wrong and a violation of the divinely constituted order of Christ's church.

3. Protestants agree in this view of the sacraments that they are signs and seals of the covenant of grace. As "signs" they exhibit to the senses under appropriate emblems, the same benefits as are exhibited under another form in the doctrines and promises of the Word of God, so that the eye may instruct and impress the heart. And they are not signs merely of the grace of God to us, but of our obligations to Him -- obligations, however, still proceeding from the same grace. As "seals" they are a Divine pledge or security that God will give to the receiver all the grace of the

covenant, and engage ourselves to the performance of them. The sacraments are not charms, nor are they mere remembrancers; they are covenant or federal acts, in which the persons who receive them with proper dispositions solemnly engage to fulfil their part of the covenant, and God confirms His promise to them in a sensible manner. According to this view of the sacraments the express institution of God is essentially requisite to constitute their nature. No rite which is not ordained of God can be conceived to be a seal of His promise or the pledge of any event that depends on His good pleasure; hence, that any rite may come up to this idea of a sacrament we require words of institution, and a promise by which the two are connected together.

As to the five sacraments (so called) which were added by the Romish church we regard as mere superstitions. They have no visible sign or ceremony ordained of God, and they stand in no direct connection with any covenant engagement entered into by Him with His creatures.

Confirmation rests on no Scriptural authority at all. Penance, if it mean anything more than repentance, is equally unsanctioned by Scripture; and if it mean "repentance toward God," it is no more a sacrament than faith or any other grace. Orders, or the ordination of ministers, is an apostolic command, but has in it no greater indication of a sacrimental act than any other such command - say the excommunication of incorrigible offenders. Matrimony - which probably was called a sacrament at first, from a misapprehension (Eph. 5:32) is no pledge and seal of the evangelical covenant, nor was it instituted for any such purpose. And Extreme Unction -- the ceremony of anointing a dying person, when all hope of recovery is gone -- is a human ceremony, and has nothing in it of a sacramental character. Those who take the Scriptures as their only authoritative guide restrict the term sacrament to those signs and seals of the evangelical covenant which are expressly recognised as such in God's word. Consequently they know of no other sacraments, or other emblematic institutions, which are at the same time enjoined means of grace, than Baptism and the Lord's Supper. All persons who

invest other ceremonies of religion with this sacramental character incur the guilt of adding to the words of God.

BAPTISM. SECTION I.

The nature of this sacrament. It is the initiatory rite into the New Testament church, and is a sign and seal of a spiritual covenant. As a sign, it represents the cleansing and poured out influences of the Holy Ghost which constitute the great promise of the gospel, and as a seal, it is on God's part a visible assurance of His faithfulness to His covenant stipulations; and on our part a pledge by which we make ourselves parties to the covenant, promising to fulfil its conditions, and claiming our right of inheritance in its truth, mercies, and hopes.

THE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

1. It is clear from the whole of the New Testament, and is not disputed, that christian baptism, when administered to adults, ought to follow their repentance and confession of faith in Christ. And when admitted to this sacrament are required to renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil. This involves a turning from sin, and a turning to God. According to this view those baptized profess to be christians. The true or invisible church on earth consists of all true believers, and as baptized persons come to the Lord's table they should give credible evidence of sincere repentance and faith before receiving the ordinance of baptism.

Many claim that water baptism had its origin in the Jewish church, in which, they maintain, it was the practice, long before Christ's time, to baptize converts or proselytes to their faith, as part of the ceremony of their admission. Many precepts relating to ceremonial pollution are mentioned in the Old Testament showing that the Jews were rendered incapable of appearing before God in the tabernacle or temple, till they were washed either by bathing or sprinkling. (Num. 19:19-20). Others teach that John the Baptist was the first administrator of baptism among the Jews.

By some the baptism of John, and that of our Saviour and His apostles,

has been supposed to be the same. But it must be observed, that though there be an agreement in some particulars, yet there is not in all. The immediate institutor of John's baptism was the Father (John 1:33); but the immediate institutor of christian baptism was Christ, (Matt. 28:19). John's baptism was a preparatory rite, referring the subjects to Christ, who was about to confer on them spiritual blessings (Matt. 3:11). John's baptism was confined to the Jews, but christian baptism was common to Jews and Gentiles (Matt. 3:5-7 and 28:19). It does not appear that John had any formula of administration, but the christian baptism has, viz. "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The baptism of John was the concluding act of the legal dispensation and, in fact, a part of it; and to be considered as one of those "divers washings" among the Jews; for he did not attempt to make any alteration in the Jewish religion, nor did the persons he baptized cease to be members of the Jewish church on account of their baptism; but christian baptism is the regular entrance into, and is a part of, the evangelical dispensation. (Gal. 3:27; Matt. 28:19; Mar. 16:15-16). It does not appear from the Bible that any one but John himself was engaged as operator in his baptism, whereas Christ baptized none, but His disciples, by His authority and in His name (John 4:2).

Baptism has been the subject of controversy, both as it respects the subject and the mode. It will be impossible to give more than a brief outline of the views entertained by christian teachers.

2. As to the subject, Antipaedobaptists hold the belief that adults only are proper subjects, because Christ's commission to baptize appears to them to restrict this ordinance to such only as are taught, or made disciples; and that consequently infants, who cannot be thus taught are to be excluded. It does not appear in the New Testament, they say, that the apostles, in executing Christ's commission, ever baptized any but those who were first instructed in the christian faith, and professed their belief in it. They contend that infants can receive no benefit from it, are not capable of faith and repentance, which are to be considered as pre-requisites.

(βαπτίζω)

As to the mode, they teach that the word in Greek baptizo signifies immersion or dipping only; that John baptized in Jordan; that he chose a place where there was much water; that Christ came up out of the water; that Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water. That the terms washing, purifying, burying in baptism, so often mentioned in the Scripture, allude to this mode; that immersion only was the practice of the apostles and first christians; and that it was only laid aside from the love of novelty, and the coldness of the climate. These positions, they think, are so clear from Scripture, and the history of the church, that they stand in need of but little argument to support them. Further, they also insist that all positive institutions depend entirely upon the will and declaration of the institutor, and that, therefore, reasoning by analogy from previous abrogated rites or ceremonies is to be rejected, and the express command of Christ respecting baptism ought to be our rule.

PAEDOBAPTISTS.

1. The Paedobaptists are of a different opinion. As to the subject, they believe that qualified adults who have not been baptized before are certainly proper subjects; but, they believe also that infants ought not to be excluded. They believe that, as the Abrahamic and the Christian covenants are the same, (Gen. 17:1-14; Heb. 8:13); that as children were admitted under the former, and that as baptism is a seal, sign, or confirmation of this covenant, infants have as great a right to it as the children had to the seal of circumcision under the law, (Acts 2:39; Rom. 4:16-18). They believe that the covenant which God made with Abraham was the covenant of grace. That it was not chiefly a political, or national covenant, but the general covenant of grace, as is obvious from the character of the blessing it promised. First -- "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee"-- a promise which includes the highest spiritual blessings, and that has ever been acknowledged and felt by God's people as the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ; in evidence of which see (Jer. 31:33; Jer. 32:38-40;

Ezek. 34:25-31; Ezek. 36:25-28; Heb. 8:10; II. Cor. 6:16-18). This promise was given to Abraham personally, and to his seed after him; i. e., to all the persons who should imitate his faith (Gal. 3:7-9-29). Secondly -- "Thou shalt be a father of many nations," which we are by Paul taught to interpret more in reference to his spiritual seed, the followers of that faith whereof cometh justification, than to his natural descendants (Rom. 4:16-18). Thirdly -- "I will give unto thee and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger," the temporal promise being but a type of the higher promise of a heavenly inheritance (Heb. 11:9-16). Fourthly -- "In thee shall all nations be blessed;" and this blessing we are expressly taught, was nothing less than the justification of all nations, i. e., of all believers in all nations, by faith in Christ (Gal. 3:8-9-14-16). Consider, then, the blessings here promised in the light of the texts referred to from Paul, and it must be evident that the covenant made with Abraham was the gospel covenant. In fact, it is called the gospel (Gal. 3:8).

(1) The covenant which God made with Abraham is still in force, and will be to the end of time. This is plainly asserted in (Gal. 3:17 and Rom. 4:16). It had no connection with "the law" or Sianitic covenant; for it existed four hundred and thirty years before it, and was not at all disannulled or set aside by it; and believers in Christ, under the New Testament dispensation, are "heirs according to the promise." Heirs of what? Of the blessedness promised to Abraham and his seed. Thus it was "an everlasting covenant," intended to continue while a believer is found upon the earth.

(2) From the commencement of the Abrahamic covenant to the subversion of the Jewish nation, infants, by the command of God, were admitted to a share in its benefits, and therefore received circumcision as its sacramental sign and seal (Gen. 17:10-13). Being thus circumcised, they were placed under covenant with God, and its frequent renewal was openly acknowledged as under the bond, and entitled to the privileges of the covenant (Deut. 10:13; Josh 8:35; II. Chron. 20:13). They were made, and acknowledged to be, part

of the Church of God, the children of God by adoption, and graciously entitled to take God as their God.

(3.) The children of christian believers were never cut off from this privilege when their fathers were received into the church whether by birth they were Jews or Gentiles. Implicit authority for relinquishing an ordinance in long standing is quite as indispensable as explicit authority for introducing one. When asked for Scripture authority for receiving children and admitting to church privileges; the answer is, by what authority of Scripture do you exclude them? And had it been the design of our Lord to exclude children from the covenant of grace, He would have, without doubt, stated it in the inauguration of the gospel economy. But no change or limitation is intimated, either by special instruction or implication. On the contrary, the sign and seal of the covenant is authorized to be observed with a universality commensurate with the commission to make disciples and to teach (Matt. 28:19). We therefore conclude, on the surest grounds, that the children of God's people still stand in a covenant relation to Him, and have a right to the initiatory ordinance of that covenant.

(4) That circumcision as a sacrament has been abolished, Paul most strenuously maintained. And that baptism has taken the place of the Abrahamic rite is manifest: -(1) From the initiatory character of the two rites. In the words of the great commission (Matt. 18:19-20 and Mark 16:15-16), baptism was expressly made the initiatory rite by which believers of all nations were to be introduced into the church and covenant of grace, just as circumcision had formerly been. And if baptism does not sustain this character, the new covenant has no initiatory rite or sacrament at all. (2) It is manifest from the following Scriptures: Col. 2:10-12, where baptism is called "the circumcision of Christ" -- the phrase being put out of the reach of frivolous criticism by the exegetical addition "buried with Him by baptism." And the only reason for which he can call baptism "the circumcision of Christ," or christian circumcision, is that it has taken the place of Abrahamic circumcision, and fills the same office of introducing believers into God's cove-

nant; and entitling them to the enjoyment of spiritual blessings. (Gal. 3: 27-29), may be adduced to the same effect; "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ..... And if ye be Christ's (by being thus baptized and putting on Christ) then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Just as circumcision, believingly submitted to, was the means by which Jews and strangers became the spiritual seed of Abraham, and the heirs of spiritual and heavenly promises, so baptism, when believingly submitted to, is followed by the same blessed results. The conclusion is therefore inevitable, that baptism has precisely the same federal character as circumcision, and that it was instituted for the same ends, and in its place.

Now, as the infants of believers were, in former ages, taken, together with their parents, into covenant with God, by the sacramental seal of that covenant, -- as the same covenant, under a fuller, clearer, and simpler discovery of it, forms now the basis of the Christian church, -- and as the privilege of bringing our infant offspring for admission into the covenant and having its token applied to them, has never been repealed, it necessarily follows that they have a right to christian baptism; for baptism is now the only appointed token or ceremony of admission.

(5) There is abundant evidence that the children of converts to the faith of the gospel were actually baptized along with their parents in the time of the apostles and the apostolic churches. If the previous state of things were really inconsistent with the spiritual nature of the new dispensation, and were therefore to be discontinued, it seems not unreasonable to expect that the language on this point should be plain and decisive. Instead of this, we meet with language in perfect accordance with the previous state of things, precisely such as writers whose minds are habituated to it would naturally use, and such as readers in similar circumstances could not understand in any other way than one. In Mark 10:13-16, our Lord explicitly declares young children (brephoi, βρέφοι, "infants") to be subjects of His kingdom -- partakers of its privileges and blessings; and are we to believe that He, at the

* It should be remembered that we have no recorded instance in the New Testament of the baptism of any person grown to manhood that ~~that~~ had been born of Jewish converts, or Gentile proselytes, to the faith of Christ; nor have we, in any of the apostolic epistles, the remotest allusion to the reception of such children, by baptism, into the Christian church. And the simplest explanation, and one in every way sufficient and satisfactory, of the total absence of everything of the sort, is the conclusion that the children of the converts who composed the churches had been baptised with their parents, on these parents entering into the fellowship of the church.

same time, cuts off all such from any external sign of connection with the kingdom He was establishing? That He declares them partaker of the blessings of the promise, and yet forbids the outward token of such participation to be any longer administered to them? In Acts 16:15-31-33; I. Cor. 1:16, we are taught that the apostles baptized "households" or families; and a man's house (oikos) most properly means his children, his offspring, his descendants, and is generally used to denote those exclusively. (Ruth 4:12; I. Kings 14: 10-14; I. Tim. 3:4) It should be noticed also, that the baptism of families is mentioned in a way that indicates its being no extraordinary occurrence, but a thing of course. We are warranted, therefore, to believe that such was the usual practice, unless it can be shown that these cases are not fair specimens of what was customary.

(6) Infant baptism has been practiced in the church from apostolic times. From A. D. 400 to A. D. 1150, no society of men, in all that period of 750 years, ever pretended to object to infant baptism; and still nearer the time of our Saviour, there appears to have been scarcely any one that so much as advised the delay of infant baptism. Irenaeus, who lived in the second century, and was well acquainted with Polycarp, who was John's disciple, declares expressly that the church learned from the apostles to baptize children. Origen, in the third century, affirmed that the custom of baptizing infants was received from Christ and His apostles. Cyprian, and a council of ministers (held about the year A. D. 254), no less than sixty-six in number, unanimously agreed that children might be baptized as soon as born. Ambrose, who wrote 274 years from the apostles, declares that the baptism of infants had been the practice of the apostles themselves, and of the church, till that time. Chrysoston, in the fifth century, says that the church, ~~till that time~~. ~~Chrysostom in the fifty century says that the church~~ everywhere declared that infants should be baptized; and Augustine affirmed that he never heard or read of any Christian, Catholic, or sectarian, but who always held that infants were to be baptized. They further believe that there needed no mention in the

New Testament in which the descendants of christian parents were baptised in adult years. And as to the objection that infants ought not to be baptised, because they cannot understand the nature and design of that sacrament, it applies with equal force against the circumcision of Abraham's descendants. Is it well for us to question the wisdom of Him who instituted the first, or the second sacrament? If infants cannot understand the nature of the sacrament, the parents can, and ought in the use of it to dedicate their offspring to God, claiming for them the grace which that sacrament symbolises and which God pledges Himself by that sacrament to impart.

(7) What are the uses of infant baptism? God enjoins nothing that is useless or unnecessary.

(1) <u>It is a memorial of fundamental truths.</u>

It emblematically reminds all who witness it of the inherent corruption of our nature, and its consequent need of the washing of regeneration. And it brings before our minds that little children are subjects of the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, and partakers of its blessings. The Lord from heaven has cancelled the great original offence and has so far removed its existence and its effects, that "the free gift has come upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. 5:18). The whole case of the child has been thus met and provided for by these redemptionary arrangements. And baptism is to signify and commemorate this glorious fact. It is the sign and the seal of the covenant of grace which secures and ratifies this provision. On this ground we have far better reasons for the baptism of an infant than we can possibly have for the baptism of an adult. Baptism is administered to an adult because he professes to be a believer in Christ, but we can have no infallible evidence that such is really the case. In an infant there is no possibility of mistake. As certainly as it is a shearer in "the offence" and "condemnation" of "the first man," so certainly is it a shearer in "the free gift" and the glorious "righteousness" of "the second man." The irresponsibility of the child, so far from invalidating its baptism, is the very thing that invests it with certainty.

(b) It is a solemn reminder of parental obligations.

For what does the institution of infant consecration, whether by circumcision or baptism, prove? It proves that we are not left to choose whether our children shall be religious or not. That they are to be so is a ruled case; since in their earliest days God claims their services and in token thereof puts the sacred mark of His covenant upon them. When the child arrives at the years of discretion, the very first thing in which it should be instructed is the duty and privilege connected with this covenant transaction. It should be taught a knowledge of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in whose undivided name it has been baptized, and every means should be taken to induce the child to become intelligently and voluntarily a party to its own baptism.

(c). This ordinance imposes an obligation upon the church of caring for those who are thus brought within its pale. If baptism has really initiated into the visible church, and if this relation be not normal but real -- not a thing mystical, airy, intangible; but a blessed reality -- surely they are entitled to the prayers and spiritual care of the church until they are fitted, by personal repentance and faith, for the privileges of its full and complete membership. The young ought thus to grow up within the precincts of the church, under her protecting and sheltering wing. It has been decided in heaven and upon earth, -- decided by their merciful God, by their parents, and by the church, -- decided so far as can be without their own voluntary consent, that they are to be the consecrated servants of God. And a very serious obligation now devolves upon the church, as well as upon the parents to give fulfilment and consumation to the design thus commenced in baptism, by bringing the children to a sincere and intelligent consecration of their service to the Lord.

WHAT IS THE PROPER MODE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

4. Paedobaptists contend that it has been successfully shown by a

detail of learned criticism that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* signify sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. But even were it admitted that *immersion* is the primary import of the word *baptizo*, not every one at all versant in languages is aware that it is not by tracing a word back to its earliest etymology that its actual meaning is to be ascertained, its particular applications of it, at subsequent periods. Even in the English language we would run ourselves into innumerable mistakes and absurdities by the adoption of such a test of the import of terms. The sole inquiry could be, what is the sense in which it is used in the Scriptures? It seems to us that there is enough to satisfy any candid, intelligent, and unprejudiced individual that *sprinkling* and *pouring* have the full approval of the Scriptures in this use of the term.

The question at issue between Baptists and Paedobaptists, relative to this matter, it should be remembered, is not this: whether immersion is valid baptism? That may be admitted and all who so desire to be immersed should be gratified. Nor is it a question whether immersion has been practiced in the christian church even in the early years of christianity. This may be admitted, but the real question at issue is this: *Is immersion essential to the ordinance?* All Baptists hold that there can be no baptism without immersion; that this *is essential.* To this view we dissent.

(1) We believe that the word *baptizo*, which is a derivation of *bapto*, and consequently must be less in its signification, should be invariably used in the New Testament to mean immersion, is not clear. It is therefore doubted whether immersion be the *only* meaning, and whether Christ absolutely enjoined immersion, and that it is His positive will that no other should be used. Among the Jews this word was used for their various ablutions, such as pouring, sprinkling, etc. (Heb. 9:10; Mark 7:4; Luke 11:38) For the custom of washing before meals, and washing of cups, pots, etc., it is evident that it does not express *the manner* of doing, whether by immersion or pouring, but *the thing done*, the application of water to the things washed.

Certainly not the immersion of the household furniture, or the persons before their meals, but rather the application of water to them in some manner.

It must be admitted that in baptism we have an express type of the descending influence of the Holy Spirit, hence pouring must be the mode of administration; for that is the Scriptural term most correctly and appropriately used for the communication of divine influences. There is no object whatever in all the New Testament so frequently and explicitly signified by baptism as those divine influences. (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8-10; Luke 3:16-22; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; Acts 2:38-39; Acts 8:18-17; Acts 11:15-16). The term sprinkling also is made use of in reference to the act of purifying (Isai. 52:15; Heb. 9:13-14; Ezek. 36:25), and cannot be, therefore, inapplicable to baptismal purification. But it is observed that John baptized in Jordan: to this it is replied, to infer always an immersion of the whole body in water from this word en here translated in, would, in many instances, be false and absurd; for the same Greek proposition en is used when it is said they should be baptized with (en) the Holy Ghost and with en fire. No one will say that immersion, or dipping is meant in either of those cases. (Matt. 3:11). The apostle, speaking of Christ, says, "He came not (en) by water only, but (en) by water and blood." There the same word (en) is translated by, and with justice and propriety, for we know no good sense in which we could say He came in water and blood. In the New Testament this word (en) is rendered "at" more than one hundred times, and in one hundred and fifty it is rendered "with." If it be rendered so here, "John baptized at Jordan," or with the water of Jordan, there is no proof of immersion.

Again it is said that Jesus came up out of the water, but the Greek preposition apo is often rendered from: for instance, "Who hath warned you to flee from, not out of, the wrath to come." (Matt. 3:7; Luke 3:7). Then we have the case of Philip and the eunuch both going down into the water (Acts 8:38). The Greek preposition eis here translated into often signifies to or unto. (Matt. 15:24; Rom. 10:10; Rom. 6:16-19). So that from these explanations we find no evidence of immersion, or dipping in these Scriptures.

yet these we have noticed are relied on mainly to prove immersion.

2. The evidence of the New Testament is in favor of the administration of christian baptism by sprinkling or pouring. (1) On the day of Pentecost about three thousand were baptized in Jerusalem (Acts 2:41). Now, a considerable part of the day was occupied in preaching; and is it likely that, at the close of the day, so great a number could have been provided with change of raiment, and then separately immersed, even if all the apostles had engaged in the service? Besides, where could the service have taken place? There was no river in Jerusalem or near to the city. (2) The most natural interpretation of the narrative of the baptism of Paul (Acts 9:17-19 and 22:16), and that of Cornelius and his family (Acts 10:46-48) is that it took place in the house, or even in the room where they were. The same appears to have been true of Lydia and her family (Acts 16:14). (3) There is every reason to conclude that the jailer and his family were not immersed. (Acts 16:33). It was midnight; there was no time to go in quest of a river. Paul and Silas were in jail. The jailer could not leave his charge. Paul and Silas, lacerated by the scourge as they had been on the previous day, were not in a condition to go down into a river. Yet the jailer and his household were baptized "straightway," that is, at once.

Two things are very noticeable in all these cases: first, the rite was of easy observance, inasmuch as we never find any delay in its administration, whatever the time, the place, or the subjects: secondly, in no case do we find the people removing to any particular place for baptism. We conclude that it could not have been administered by immersion, which in some places was impossible, at some seasons would be dangerous to life, especially in a cold and rigorous climate, and to persons of feeble health. And we cannot believe that our blessed Lord, who intended that His gospel should be preached to every creature, would append to it, and make essential, a rite which is so ill fitted for universal practice.

3. Pouring or Sprinkling is more in harmony with the genius and

spirit of christianity than immersion. (1) Because it more correctly represents the spiritual influence which baptism symbolises. "I will pour out my Spirit upon you," "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean." This pouring out and sprinkling of the Holy Ghost is called the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, of which water baptism is the instituted sign. It seems evident, therefore, that pouring or sprinkling must be a proper, if not the most appropriate mode of water baptism. (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:25; Acts 1:32-33; Acts 10:44-48). (2) It accords the most fully with the universal character of christianity. Some nations inhabit regions of snow and ice, where immersion, during the greater part of the year, is impracticable, especially in the case of sick or invalid people. Will it be suggested that such persons should defer their baptism until summer, or until they recover health? Health may never return. With the apostles, no ordinance of Christ was, according to the record, impracticable at any time. Besides, life is short and uncertain; and are believers who desire to comply with the Lord's command to die in neglect of a sacrament, by which their right to salvation is recognized, because it cannot be administered with safety? Such consequences are not connected with affusion. (3) It is, beyond comparison, the best adapted to that calm and collected state of mind in which one should receive this holy sacrament. It is a covenanting ordinance; and when one receives it, there should be a believing apprehension of Christ and of salvation, with entire surrender to God. In order to this one should be in full possession of his mental faculties and free from distraction; but the act of immersion, especially in some cases, produces excitement, agitation, and tremor, which are totally destructive of serious and sacred emotions and thoughts. The administration of the rite by affusion obviates all this. And the mode which conduces most to edification is in fullest accordance with the spirit of the gospel, and therefore is to be preferred. (4) There is nothing in any Scripture allusion that leads to a contrary result. Two texts are often adduced as containing undoubted allusion to immersion

(Rom. 6:3-4; Col. 2:11-13). The mind may easily habituate itself to the idea of likeness between being let down under the earth and raised out of it, and being let down under water and raised out of it. But where is the likeness between the latter of these and the carrying of a body by a lateral door into a cavern hewn out of a rock, and that body reviving, and coming forth by the same door? which were the real circumstances of the burial and resurrection of our Saviour. This resemblance has always appeared as a far-fetched fancy. What, then, does Paul mean by "buried with Him in baptism?" He reminds us of our mystical union and conformity to Christ. He died for sin; believers die to sin (I. Pet. 4:1-2; Rom. 6:8-11). He died by crucifiction; believers are to crucify the flesh, and are crucified to the world (Gal. 5:24; Gal. 6:14). He was buried and cut off from the world; believers are buried with Him in the sense of being separated from the spirit and example of the world and their former sinful practices. He was raised: they are risen with Him, risen from the death of sin, having, as it were, left their former selves and character in the grave (Col. 3:1-3). He is seated at the right hand of God in heaven; and believers are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ (Eph. 1:3-20). Now, when baptism is rightly received, it is the entrance upon the christian life in which all this mystical conformity to Christ is realized; for under the term baptism he comprehends all that baptism signifies, just as Peter does (I. Pet. 3:21), where he shows that it is not the outward washing that saves us, but such a change in our state and character as produces "the answer of a good conscience towards God."

Having given an outline of the different views entertained by christians relative to baptism, both as to the subject and the mode, I will sum up the whole by observing:-

(1) That any one of the three modes of administering the rite of baptism appears to be scriptural.

(2) That affusion -- pouring, or sprinkling has the sanction of

scriptural authority, as a mode under which the Holy Spirit represents His influences on the soul: "I will pour out my Spirit upon you," etc. "I will sprinkle clean water, etc."

(3) That this mode is adapted to all ages, all countries, and all circumstances.

(4) Seeing that three modes of baptism appear to have the sanction of the Bible, and have been recognized by the wisest and best christians who have lived, the choice may be left to expediency or propriety, and that, therefore, all angry controversy on this question should forever cease.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The passages of Scripture directly referring to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are the following:- Matt. 26:26-28, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Mark 14:22-24, "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many."

Luke 22:19-20, "And He took bread, and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."

I. Cor. 10:15-17, "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ. For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."

I. Cor. 11:23-29, "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He break it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat

this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

1. These Scriptures plainly teach, that the Lord's Supper is a divine institution of perpetual obligation; that the material elements to be used in the celebration, are bread and wine; that the important constituent parts of the service are: (1) The consecration of the elements. (2) The breaking of the bread and pouring out of the wine. (3) The distribution and the reception by the communicants of the bread and wine.

The design of this ordinance as unfolded by the Scriptures given, is, (1) To commemorate the death of our Saviour. (2) To represent and avow the union of believers with Christ and with each other. (4) To signify and seal our acceptance of the new covenant as ratified by the blood of Christ.

The conditions for profitable communion are, knowledge to discern the Lord's body, faith to feed upon Him, and love to Christ and to His people.

2. All believers in the Lord Jesus who are living godly lives have a <u>right</u> to this ordinance. Such persons constitute the family of God; and this table belongs to the children. Every genuine penitent is invited to come, and consequently has a right, because he needs the atoning blood, which by this ordinance is "evidently set forth" before the eye of his faith. But all open unbelievers, who reject the doctrine of the atonement made by the vicarious death of Christ; and all profane and careless persons, who refuse salvation according to the terms of the gospel;and all uncharitable persons, whose bosoms are the seat of bitterness, wrath, anger, or malice should, by the very nature of the ordinance, be carefully excluded.

3. <u>The relation of the Lord's Supper to the Jewish Passover.</u>

There are many circumstances in which these ordinances resemble each other. (1) The Passover was of Divine appointment,so was the Lord's

Supper, (2) The Passover was a sacrament, so is the Lord's Supper. (3) The Passover was a memorial of a great deliverance from temporal bondage; the Lord's Supper is a memorial of a greater deliverance from spiritual bondage. (4) The Passover prefigured the death of Christ before it was accomplished. The Lord's Supper represents that death now past. (5) The Passover was a kind of federal rite between God and man; so is the Lord's Supper as it points out the blood of the sacrifice offered for the ratification of the covenant between God and man. (6) As no one could partake of the paschal lamb before he was circumcised (Exod. 12), so no person should come to the Lord's Supper till he has been baptized. (7) As the Jews were required to come to the Passover free from all defilement; so, in approaching the Lord's Supper is the believer to purge out the leaven of malice and wickedness. (I. Cor. 5: 7-8; I. Cor. 11:27-29). (8) As the Passover was to continue as long as the Jewish law was in force, so is the Lord's Supper to continue till Christ shall come again (I. Cor. 11:26). The many resembling circumstances abundantly show that this sacrament was in great measure copied from the paschal feast, and was intended to supply its place, only heightening the design, and improving the application.

4. The Names given this ordinance.

The most ancient, and perhaps the most universal, name by which the rite has been distinguished is that of the Eucharist from the Greek Eucharistia (Eucharistia) which signifies thanks (Matt. 26:27; I. Cor. 11:24); because it is a thankful remembrance of the atonement. It is called the Communion from I. Cor. 10:16, because the faithful partakers of it have therein communion with the Lord Jesus, being made partakers of the benefits of His death, and communion with each other in this family feast of love. It is called Sacrament in reference to the sacramentum, or military oath, because in it the disciples take the vows of the Lord upon them and ratify the covenant engagements which they made on entering the church. It is called the Lord's Supper, as our Lord instituted it Himself.

5. The Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper.

It is a commemorative sign and seal of the covenant of our redemption. In other words it is both a sign and a seal of the grace of the new covenant, which is offered to us, and confirmed to us, in every celebration; and when we observe it in faith, we become new parties to this covenant, and its grace stands afresh confirmed in us. That the Lord's Supper is a covenant or sacramental rite may be deduced from the words, "This is My body; This is My blood" -- the elements being a sign or representation of the body and blood of Christ as the price of our redemption; and from the words, "This is My blood of the new testament," diathēkē or covenant, "which is shed for many." The covenant itself was ratified by the blood of Christ, which is therefore called "the blood of the everlasting covenant;" and "the cup" is a visible sign that this covenant exists in full undiminished force from age to age, and a visible pledge that the God of the covenant will give to the receiver all the promised grace of the covenant on the appointed terms. And the believing communicant, as he receives the appointed elements, gives a public and visible indication that he consents to become a party to the covenant, and binds himself to fulfil all its conditions.

6. The Elements and The Consecration.

(1) Bread and wine are the elements employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, because they are the simple corporal materials employed as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ. As the Lord's Supper was originally instituted in connection with the Passover, there is no doubt that unleavened bread was used on that occasion. It is evident, however, from apostolic history, that the Apostles used whatever kind of bread was at hand. There is no significancy either in the kind of bread or in the form of the loaf. It is enough that it is bread. This makes it the proper emblem of Him who declared Himself to be the true bread which came down from heaven.

By wine as prescribed to be used in this ordinance, is to be understood "the juce of the grape;" and "the juice of the grape" in that state

which was, and is, in common use, and in the state in which it was known as wine. The wine of the Bible was a manufactured article. It was not the juice of the grape as it exists in the fruit, but the juice submitted to such a process of fermentation as secured its preservation and gave it the qualities ascribed to it in Scripture. That oinos in the Bible when unqualified by such terms as new or sweet means the fermented juice of the grape is not an open question. It has never been questioned in the history of the church, if we except a few christians of late years.

The Lord's Supper having been instituted at the table of the Paschal supper, and the wine used in the Passover being mixed with water, it is morally certain that the wine used by Christ when instituting this sacrament, was also mixed. Hence it was inferred that His disciples in all ages should follow His example. That the Paschal cup contained wine mixed with water rests on the authority of Jewish writers.

Consecration of the Elements.

(2) The first is the consecrating prayer, this prayer is threefold in its object. To give thanks to God for the gift of His Son whose sacrifice we are about to commemorate. Secondly, to prepare the hearts of the communicants for the solemn service on which they are entering. This prayer should be appropriate. This is a matter of great importance. Often these prayers are long and rambling. Petitions are offered for all classes and conditions of men, the young, the old, the sick, the Sunday School, etc., etc., etc. The consequence is, that the minds of the people are distracted. Their attention turned from the service before them rather than to it. The third object of this prayer is the consecration of the elements. Bread and wine in themselves, or as found in common use, are not the symbols of the body and blood of Christ. They become such only by being set apart for that purpose. This is an important part of the service; and is made prominent by all branches of the church as seen in their liturgies, and their Directories for worship.

7. Some of the errors relative to this sacrament.

(1) That of the Romish church, which is as follows: "In the Lord's

Supper Christ is really, truly, and substantially contained; Bel-man, body and blood, bones and nerves, under the appearance of bread and wine." They attempt to prove it thus. "Our Lord Himself says, 'This is My body.' Therefore, upon consecration, there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole substance of Christ's body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; and this we term transubstantiation. Yet we must not suppose that Christ is broken, when the host or consecrated bread is broken; because there is whole and entire Christ under the species of every particle of bread, and under the species of every drop of wine." This absurd dogma, for denying which rivers of righteous blood have been shed by state persecutions and by religious wars, springs entirely from overlooking the simple fact that there is scarcely a more common form of speech, either in Scripture or in any language on the earth, than "that is," for this signifies or represents. We say of a picture on the wall, "this is Washington;" "that is Webster," etc.; while every one knows that these pictures are only representations of the persons. And instances of the same kind are to be found all through the Bible. (Gen. 41:26-27; Dan. 7:17-24; Matt. 13:38-39; Luke 8:21; I. Cor. 10:4; Gal. 4:24-25). And after such unequivocal testimony from the Scriptures, can any one doubt that "this is My body" has any other meaning than "this represents My body."

(2) That of the Lutheran Church.

"Luther denied that the elements were changed after consecration, and therefore, taught that the bread and wine indeed remain, but that together with them there is present the substance of the body of Christ, which is literally received by communicants." This theory was designated by the term consubstantiation, and was adopted probably in deference to what was conceived to be the literal meaning of the words of Christ when the Lord's Supper was instituted. But as those who hold this view neither regard the consecrated elements as a sacrifice, nor attribute to them any physical virtue, nor render them objects of adoration, their errors may be considered rather of a speculative than of a practical nature.

(3) <u>That of Socinus and his followers -- Unitarians.</u>

They teach that this solemn rite is not essentially distinct from any other ceremony. It consists of a symbolical action in which something external and material is employed to represent what is spiritual and invisible and may therefore be of use in reviving the remembrance of past events, and in cherishing pious sentiments; but that its effect is purely moral, and that it contributes to the improvement of the individual in the same manner with reading the Bible and many other exercises of religion. This doctrine, like all other parts of that system, represents religion in the simple view of being a lesson of righteousness, and loses sight of that character of the gospel which is meant to be implied in calling it a covenant of grace.

CHAPTER ~~XVII.~~ XVI.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

This is a very difficult subject, and cannot be adequately discussed without taking a survey of all the prophetic teaching of the Scriptures both of the Old Testament and of the New. The second coming of Christ has excited interest in all ages of the church, many volumes have been written attempting to interpret the prophecies relating to it, but no one has yet been able to give an interpretation that is satisfactory to all Bible students.

One thing is often overlooked. Prophecy is very different from history. It is not intended to give us a knowledge of the future, analogous to that which history gives us of the past. We see interpreters undertaking to give detailed expositions of the prophecies of Daniel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and of the Apocalypse, relating to the future, with the same confidence with which they would record the events of yesterday. Such interpretations have always been falsified by the event. In prophecy, instruction is subordinate to moral impression. The occurrence of important events is so predicted as to produce in the minds of God's people faith that they will certainly come to pass. Enough is made known of their nature, and of the time and mode of their occurrence, to awaken attention, desire, and apprehension, as the case may be; and to secure proper effort on the part of those concerned to be prepared for what is to come to pass. Although such predictions may be variously misinterpreted before their fulfilment; yet when fulfilled, the agreement between the prophecy and the event is seen to be such as to render the divine origin of the prophecy a matter of certainty. Thus with regard to the first advent of Christ, the Old Testament prophecies rendered it certain that a great Redeemer was to appear; that He was to be a Prophet, Priest, and King; that He would deliver His people from their sins, and from the evils oppressing them; that He was to establish a kingdom that would ultimately absorb all other kingdoms; and that He would render all His people supremely blessed. These predictions had the effect of turning the minds

of the whole Jewish nation to the future, in confident expectation that the Deliverer would come; of exciting earnest desire for His advent, and of leading the pious among them to prayerful preparation for His coming. Nevertheless, of all the hundreds of thousands to whom these prophecies of the Old Testament were made known, not a single person, so far as it appears in the history of the church, interpreted them aright; yet, when fulfilled, we can construct a history of the events from these misunderstood predictions concerning them. Christ was a King, but no such King as the world had ever seen, and such as no man expected; He was a priest, but the only priest that ever lived of whose priesthood He was himself the victim; He did establish a kingdom, but it was not of this world. It was foretold that Elias should first come and prepare the way of the Lord. He did come; but in a way in which no man did or could have anticipated.

The Jews were not disappointed in the general impression made on their minds by the predictions relating to the Messiah. It was only in the explanation of details that they failed. The Messiah was a King; He did sit upon the throne of David, but not in the way in which they expected; He is to subdue all nations, not by the sword, as they supposed, but by truth and love; He was to make His people kings and priests but not worldly princes or rulers. The utter failure of the Old Testament church in the interpretation of the prophecies relating to the first advent of Christ, should teach us to be modest and diffident in explaining those which relate to the second coming of Christ. We should be satisfied with the great truths which those prophecies unfold, and leave the details to be explained, in God's own time, by the events themselves.

The Scriptures clearly teach, we believe, first that there is to be a second personal, visible, and glorious advent of Jesus Christ. Secondly, that the events which are to precede that advent, are (1) The universal diffusion of the gospel; or, as our Lord expresses it, the ingathering of His people; this is now the great mission of the church. (2) The conversion of

the Jews, which is to be national. Their casting away was national, although a remnant was saved; so their conversion may be national, although some may remain in unbelief. (5) The coming of the Antichrist. Thirdly, that the events which are to attend the second coming of Christ are:-

(1) The resurrection of the dead, of the just and of the unjust.

(2) The general judgment.

(3) The end of the world, and

(4) The consumation of Christ's kingdom.

1. <u>The Second Personal Advent of Christ.</u> All students of the Bible will admit that the words "coming of the Lord" are often used in the Scriptures for any signal manifestation of His presence either for mercy or judgment. When Christ promised to manifest Himself to His disciples, "Judas saith unto Him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14:22-23) There is a coming of Christ, true and real which is not outward and visible. Thus also in the epistle to the church at Pergamos it is said: "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly." (Rev. 2:16). This form of expression is used frequently in the Bible. The Hebrews called any signal manifestation of power --especially any dreadful calamity -- a coming of the Lord. It was a coming of Jehovah when His vengeance strewed the ground with the corpses of Sennacherib's host; when its storm swept Jerusalem as with fire, and bore Israel into bondage; when its sword came down upon Idumea and was bathed in blood upon Edom. "The day of the Lord" is another term of precisely similar import. It occurs in the Old Testament fifteen times. In every instance it means some mighty manifestation of God's power in chastisement.

(1) Reasoning by analogy we conclude that as Christ's first advent was in person and visible, so His second advent must be. The two advents are often spoken of in connection, the one illustrating the other. He came the first time as the Lamb of God bearing the sins of the world; He is to come

"the second time, without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9:28). "God shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began (Acts. 3:20-21). Christ is now invisible to us, having been received up into heaven. He is to remain thus invisible, until God shall send Him at the restitution of all things.

(2) In many places it is directly stated that His advent is to be personal and visible. At the time of His ascension, the angels said to His disciples; "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." (Acts 1:11). His second coming is to be as visible as His ascension. They saw Him go; and they shall see Him come again. In Matt. 26:64 it is said, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." (Matt. 24:30). "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Also in Luke 21:27, "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud."

(3) That the apostles understood Christ to predict His second coming in person does not admit of doubt. Certain it is that they believed that He would come visibly and with great glory, and they regarded His coming as the great object of expectation and desire. Hence christians are described as those who "are waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (I. Cor. 1:7); as those who are "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Tit. 2:13). It is to them who look for Him, He is to "appear the second time unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28). It is a marked characteristic of the apostolic writings that they give such prominence to the doctrine of the second advent. "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come" (I. Cor. 4:5). "Christ the first fruits; afterwards they are Christ's at His coming." (I. Cor. 15:23). "Now

conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ." (Phil. 3:20). "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." (Col. 3:4) "Not a sure hope.....are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming (I. Thess. 2:19) "Unblamable in holiness.....at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints." (I. Thess. 3:13) "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord.....shall be caught up.....in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (I. Thess. 4:15-17). In his second letter to the Thess. he assures them that they shall have rest, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." (II. Thess. 1:7). The coming of Christ, however, he tells them was not at hand; there must "come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." Paul said to Timothy, "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ (. Tim. 6:14). "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing (II. Tim. 4:8). The epistles of Peter afford the same evidence of the deep hold which the promise of Christ's second coming had taken on the minds of the Apostles and of all the early christians. He tells his brethren that they "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time..... that the trial of your faith.....might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ." (I. Pet. 1:5-7). "When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory, etc." (I. Pet. 5:4). "We have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty." (II. Pet. 16). The transfiguration on the mount was a type and pledge of the glory of the second advent. Peter warns the disciples that scoffers would come saying,"where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." In answer to this objection he reminds them that

the threatened deluge was long delayed, but came at last: that time is not with God as it is with us; that with Him a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. He repeats the assurance that "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." (II. Pet. 3:3-10)

From these Scriptures and many others of like import, in fact, from the whole drift of the New Testament, it is plain that the apostles fully believed that there is to be a second coming of Christ; that His coming is to be in person, visible, and glorious; that they kept this great event constantly before their own minds and urged it on the attention of the people, as a motive to patience, constancy, joy, and holy living; that the apostles believed that the second advent of Christ would be attended by the general resurrection, the final judgment, and the end of the world.

Section I.

The Universal Proclamation of the Gospel.

The first great event which is to precede the second advent of Christ is the universal proclamation of the gospel. This argument is founded on the predictions contained in the Old Testament. It is there distinctly foretold that when the Messiah appeared the Spirit should be poured out on all flesh, and that all men should see the salvation of God. The Messiah was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of His people Israel. The feet of those who brought the glad tidings and published peace, were to be beautiful upon the mountains. God said in Hosea 2:23, "I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." And in Isaiah 45:22-23, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself.....that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." This means that the true religion shall prevail over the whole world.

Jehovah shall everywhere be recognized and worshipped as the only true God. We should remember that these and many other passages of like import are quoted and applied by the Apostles to the gospel dispensation. They were enforced on the attention of those to whom they wrote as showing the Gentiles that the gospel was designed for them as well as for the Jews; and to impress upon the church its obligation to preach the gospel to every creature under heaven.

Christ repeatedly taught that the gospel was to be preached to all nations before His second coming. In Matt. 24:14, Christ said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Again in Mark 13:10, "The gospel must first be published among all nations."

Our Lord after His resurrection, in giving His commission to the disciples, said; "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:19-20. See also Mark 16:15) This commission sets forth the duty of the church, and the promise of Christ to be with His church, as then commissioned, to the end of the world, implies the obligation of the church to teach the nations until "all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Eph. 4:11-13).

The Apostles understood the commission and went everywhere teaching that God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles; that He is rich in mercy towards all who call upon Him; that the gospel was designed and adapted for the whole world; for all classes of men; not only for the Jews and the Gentiles, but for all men. It is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth.

Our Lord, in His prayer concerning His disciples said, "As thou

hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." He would not leave them alone; He promised to send the Paraclete who should bring all things to their remembrance. The Spirit was to abide with them and dwell in them, so that it would not be they who spoke, but the Spirit of the Father who spoke in them; that Spirit was to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment; He was to render their preaching the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. Their simple duty was to teach; their commission was, "Go teach all nations."

One of the great elements of the Papal apostacy was the idea derived from paganism, that the main design of the church is "cultus," worship, and not instruction. The Apostles, as Peter teaches (Acts 1:22), and as is everywhere else taught in Scripture, were to be witnesses of Christ; to bear testimony to His doctrines, to the facts of His life; to His death, and especially to His resurrection, on which everything else depended. As, however, of themselves they could do nothing, they were required to attempt nothing, but to abide in Jerusalem until they were imbued with power from on high. When thus imbued they began at once to declare the wonderful works of God to Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Lybya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians; making thus the first proclamation of the gospel after the resurrection of Christ typical of its design and destiny as the religion of the whole world. Being suited to all men, it should be preached to all men. Paul magnified his office; he thanked God for giving him grace to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. He said that he was under obligation to preach the gospel both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise. He devotes no small part ~~part~~ of his epistle to the Ephesians, to setting forth the purpose of God to bring the Gentiles into His church, and to make them equally with the Jews partakers of the redemption of Christ. He teaches that the middle wall of partition be-

tween the two had been broken down, and that the Gentiles were no more "strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." In Rom. 11:25, Paul teaches that the national conversion of the Jews is not to take place "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." This ingathering of the heathen is the special work of the church. It is missionary work. It was so understood by the Apostles. Their two great duties were the propagation and defence of the truth. While they labored night and day, and traveled hither and thither through all parts of the Roman empire, preaching the gospel, they labored no less earnestly in its defense. All the epistles of the New Testament, those of Paul, Peter, John, and James are directed towards the correction of false doctrine. These two duties of propagating and of defending the truth, the Apostles devolved on their successors. During the apostolic age and for some time after it, to preach the gospel to all nations, to bring all men to the knowledge of the truth, was felt to be the special mission of the Apostles. Gradually, and especially after the conversion of Constantine and the establishment of christianity as the religion of the Roman empire, the mind of those who now had embraced christianity was directed principally in perfecting its organization and in defending it against the numerous forms of error by which it was assailed.

From this time for long centuries the church found its hands filled with its internal affairs. Its energies were expended mainly in three directions, in building a hierarchy with a supreme pontiff, surrounded by ecclesiastical princes, which sought to concentrate in itself all power over the bodies and souls of men; in founding numerous orders of monks; and in the subtleties of metaphysical discussions. The work of missions during this period was almost entirely neglected.

When the Reformation came in the sixteenth century the Protestants had as much as they could do to live. There had arrayed against them everywhere the tremendous power of the Roman church, and in most cases all the

power of the state. They had to defend their doctrines against the prejudices and bigotry of the age, to organize their churches, while among themselves there were differences of opinion that greatly hindered the cause of truth. Meanwhile, the Romish church was not inactive, and many thousands of Protestants met death in the most cruel and violent manner conceivable. It is not strange that under these circumstances the command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," was almost forgotten. It is only within the last sixty years that the people of God have been brought to realize their duty in seeking the conversion of the world. More has been done in this direction during the last half century than was accomplished during the preceding five hundred years. It is to be hoped that a new baptism of the Spirit like that on the day of Pentecost may be experienced whose fruits shall as far exceed those of the first effusion as the millions of believers now exceed in number the one hundred and twenty souls then gathered in Jerusalem.

It is realized now by the church that the conversion of the Gentile world is the great work assigned it under the present dispensation and that it must not relax its efforts, or await the second coming of Christ to accomplish it. The wonderful success of missions in our day inspires the church to hope for greater achievments. Barriers once deemed insurmountable have been removed; facilities of access and intercourse have been increased a hundred fold; missionary stations have been established in every part of the world; many thousands of converts have been gathered into the churches and hundreds of thousands of children are receiving religious instruction; the foundations of ancient systems of idolatry have been undermined; nations lately heathen have become christian, and are taking part in sending the gospel to those still sitting in darkness; and nothing seems wanting to secure the gathering in of the Gentiles, but a revival of the missionary spirit of the apostolic age in the churches of this generation.

Section 2.

The Conversion of the Jews.

The second great event which is to precede the second coming of Christ is the national conversion of the Jews. God called Abraham and promised that through him, and in his seed, all the nations of the earth should be blessed. He entered into a solemn covenant with him again to be his God and the God of his posterity to the latest generations; and that they should be His people. God preserved the Hebrews, although comparatively few in numbers amid hostile nations, from distraction until the promised seed of Abraham appeared and accomplished His redeeming work. Isaiah predicted that for their idolatry the people would be carried into captivity, but that a remnant should be restored to their own land and their privileges secured to them again. Joel and Zechariah predicted that for their rejection of the Messiah they would be scattered to the ends of the earth, but that God would restore them, and that His favor should not be finally withdrawn from them. All the prophets made general predictions of a like character, and it is a fact that the Jews are the most wonderfully preserved people in the world. In spite of the wrongs and oppressions to which, for ages, they have been subjected, yet they are a peculiar people.

The most decisive passage, however, bearing on this subject is the eleventh chapter of Romans. Paul shows, (1) That God had cast off the Jews as a nation because they, as a nation, represented by the Sanhedrim, the High Priest, the Scribes and the Pharisees, by their rulers of every class, and by the popular voice had rejected Christ. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." Therefore, as a nation, God rejected them. (2) This rejection, however, he here teaches, was not entire. There was "a remnant according to the election of grace" who believed in Christ and were received into His kingdom. (3) This national rejection of Israel, as it was not entire, so neither was it to be final. It was to continue until the bringing in of the Gentiles. God had made a covenant with Abraham that his

posterity should be the people; and 'the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.' Therefore, although broken off from the olive-tree at the present, they will be grafted in again. (4) "Then all Israel is to be saved." Whether this means the Jews as a nation, or the whole people of God including Jews and Gentiles may be a question. But in either case it is, in the light of the context, a promise of the restoration of the Jews as a nation. There is, therefore, to be a national conversion of the Jews. This conversion is to take place before the second advent of Christ. This the Apostle teaches when he says, that the salvation of the Gentiles was designed to provoke the Jews to jealousy (Rom. 11:11) and that the mercy shown to the Gentiles was to be the means of the Jews obtaining mercy (Rom. 11:31). The rejection of the Jews was the occasion of the conversion of the Gentiles; and the conversion of the Gentiles is to be the occasion of the restoration of the Jews. Our Lord said, (Matt. 23:39) "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" -- so it is certain that, when Jesus comes, who will be visible to all the world, as the lightning which cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, when all eyes, even of those who pierced Him and all kindreds of the earth shall see (Rev. 1:7; Zech. 12:10) -- the Jews must have been converted and have become a christian nation. In addition to this the apostle Peter (Acts 3:19-21) exhorts to repentance and conversion until the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord shall come; so it appears to be beyond all doubt that the conversion of Israel is to precede the second advent of Christ.

According to one view, the Jews after their conversion are to be restored to the land of their fathers and there constitute a distinct nation. According to another, their restoration to their own land is to precede their conversion. And according to a third view there is to be no such restoration, but that they are to be converted and included in the great body of believers as they were in the times of the apostles. This last view is the

one commonly held by the church.

The Scriptures, as they are generally understood, teach that before the second advent of Christ, there is to be the ingathering of the heathen; that the gospel must be preached to all nations; and also that there is to be a national conversion of the Jews; but it is not to be inferred from this that either all the heathen or all the Jews are to become true christians. In many cases the conversion may be merely nominal. There will probably enough remain unchanged in heart to be the tools of that persecuting power which shall bring about those days of tribulation which the Bible teaches are to immediately precede the coming of the Lord.

Section 2.

Antichrist.

That antichrist is to appear before the second coming of Christ is plainly asserted in II. Thess. 2:1-3, "We beseech you.....that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled.....as that the day of Christ is at hand.....for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." This is clear; but as to who or what antichrist is there is a diversity of opinion. Some understand by that term any antichristian spirit, or power, or person. The Apostle John says, "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.....Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ. He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." (I. John 2:18-22). Again, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." (I. John 4:3). And in II. John 7, it is said "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." Our Lord predicted, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and

shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." (Matt. 24:24). And the Apostle Paul says in1. Tim. 4:1, "The spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." These Scriptures refer to a marked characteristic of the time intervening between the apostolic age and the second advent of Christ. There were to be many antichrists, many malignant manifestation in opposition to the person and mission of Christ; many attempts to cast off His authority and overthrow His kingdom. Besides this general reference to the antichristian spirit which was to manifest itself in different forms and with different degrees of intensity, many believe that there is yet to be a person, in whom the power of the world shall be concentrated and who will exert all his energies to overthrow christianity, and to usurp the place of Christ on earth. This is the Antichrist of prophecy; of whom it is asserted that Daniel, Paul, and John in the Apocalypse speak. This is the view of Romanists and many Protestants. The opinion held by Protestants generally is, however, that the prophecies concerning Antichrist have special reference to the papacy. This conviction is based largely on Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians. The first question to be determined in the interpretation of this Scripture is, whether Antichrist is a particular individual, or an institution, a power, or a corporation. Protestants generally adopt the latter view and regard the papacy as the Antichrist of Scripture. In favor of this view it is urged that it is according to the analogy of prophecy to speak of nations, institutions, or kingdoms, as individuals. In Daniel, the ten kings are ten kingdoms or dynasties; the several beasts which he saw in vision were not the Symbols of particular men, but of nations. Daniel 7 ch., When therefore the Apostle speaks of Antichrist as "the man of sin," and "the son of perdition" it is in harmony with Scripture usage to understand him to refer to an order of men or to an institution. In the Antichrist have described an ecclesiastical, or a civil power, and in it to exist in the church or in

the world? The designations "man of sin" and "son of perdition" have a religious import, and are more appropriately applied to an ecclesiastical than to a worldly power or potentate. The seat of power when Antichrist should appear was to be in the "temple of God." This clearly indicates that it is an ecclesiastical, usurping, tyrannical and persecuting power that is here described. The expression "temple of God" is often used in Scripture, especially by Paul, to designate the church of Christ. The coming of Antichrist is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders. This is not the way worldly potentates win their power; they rely on force. But this is the way, as though traced by the pen of history instead of the light of prophecy, in which the papacy has attained and maintained its fearful ascendency in the world. Its power has been achieved mainly by fraud, "by the deceivableness of unrighteousness;" by forged documents and false pretenses, by claiming that Peter was made primate over the whole church and the vicar, or plenipotentiary of Christ on earth; that he was the bishop of Rome; that his successors in that office were his successors in that primacy; and that as the vicar of Christ he was superior to all earthly potentates, not merely as the spiritual is above the temporal, but as lord of the consciences, authorized to decide what was right and what was wrong for them to do in all the relations as men and as rulers; which is a claim of absolute dominion. The false claim of the papacy to have supreme authority over the faith of men, to decide for them what they must believe on the pain of eternal perdition, and further the claim to the power to forgive sin is, doubtless, the most fearful assumption of power ever claimed by sinful man. This a two-fold power, answering to the twofold penalty attached to sin, namely the eternal penalty as a violation of the divine law, and the penances still due after the remission of the eternal penalty, as satisfactions to divine justice. The former can be obtained only through the absolution of the priest; and the latter can be remitted at the discretion of the church. This

includes power of purgatory, the pains of which are represented as [illegible] and of indefinite duration. These pains the pope and his subordinates falsely claim the power to alleviate or remit. These claims have no parallel in the world. If such pretentions as these do not constitute the power that makes them antichrist, then nothing remains that can be so regarded. Any that may arise in the future will be a small affair compared to the papacy. The apostle tells us, these portentous claims, these unrighteous deceits, were to be supported by "signs and lying wonders." They have ever been and still are the chief supports of the papacy. There is not a false doctrine which it teaches which is not sustained by "lying wonders." Its whole history is a history of apparitions of the Virgin Mary, or of saints and angels; and of miracles of every possible description from the most wonderful to the most absurd. The whole system, so far as it is distinctive, is a system of falsehoods, supported by deceit. Romanists hold the truths of natural religion; and many of the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel. This we must admit. Nor can we deny, that where truth is, there may be its fruits also. While Protestants condemn the false claims of the papacy they [illegible] there are such good men among Romanists as Bernard, Fenelon, and Pascal, and doubtless many more known only to God.

The principal difference between the early Protestants and the modern evangelical writers is, that the former identify Babylon and Antichrist; that is, they refer to one and the same power the prophecies of Daniel relating to the little horn; the description given by Paul in II. Thess. 2 ch.; and the account of the beast as given by John in Revelations, chapters 13 and 17. Whereas, modern interpreters generally distinguish between the two. The papacy they regard as set forth under the symbol of Babylon; and Antichrist, as a worldly potentate, which came up out of the abyss.

The great truth set forth in these prophecies of Daniel, and the Apostles was that there would be in time a great apostacy in the church; that this apostacy would be antichristian and would allow itself [illegible]

become a great persecuting power; and that the two elements, the ecclesiastical and the worldly, which enter into this great antichristian development, will, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, become more prominent; sometimes acting in harmony, and sometimes opposed one to the other; and, therefore, sometimes spoken of as one, and sometimes as two distinct powers. Both, as united or as separate, are to be overtaken with final destruction when the Lord comes. So much is certain, that any and every power, be it one or more, which answers to the description given by Daniel, Paul, and John is Antichrist in the Scriptural sense of the term.

According to the common faith of believers, the three great events which are to precede the second advent of Christ, are the universal proclamation of the gospel or the conversion of the Gentile world; the national conversion of the Jews; and the appearance of Antichrist.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

The doctrine of the resurrection is taught in the Old Testament, Job 14:12-15 and Job 19:25-27; Psalms 17:15; Isa. 25:8, compare with I. Cor. 15:54; Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2-13; Hosea 13:14. Nothing was more common in Old Testament times than for the deliverance of the people from great calamities to be compared to a resurrection, a life, a revivication e. g. Ezek. 37:11-14. From this we conclude that the doctrine of the resurrection was at that time a popular doctrine; for an image which is assumed in order to represent anything in the way of metaphor or allegory, whether poetical or prophetical, must be an image commonly known and understood, otherwise it will not answer the purpose for which it is assumed. And from the following passages in the New Testament we have the clearest assurance that the belief of a resurrection was held by the Old Testament church, both under the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations (Matt. 22:30-32; Acts 23:6-8; Acts 24:14-15; Acts 26:6-8; Heb. 11:35).

Our Lord said, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5:28). Again, "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations," (Matt. 25:31-32). Paul said in his speech before Felix (Acts 24:15) avowing it as his own faith and that of his fathers that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust."" John says in Rev. 20:12-13, "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (Hades, Ἅδης) gave up the dead which were in them." (See also John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; Rom. 8:11, 22, 23; I. Cor. 15; Phil. 3:11-20-21; I. Thess. 4:13-17)

At what time will the general resurrection occur? At the second advent of our Lord, and immediately preparatory to the general judgment. The general resurrection is represented as connected with the second advent of Christ and the final judgment (Matt. 24:30-31; Matt. 25:31-46; II. Thess. 1:7-10, and elsewhere).

Will the righteous and the wicked be resurrected simultaneously? The millennarian view is that the resurrection of the righteous will occur at the commencement, and the wicked at the close, of the thousand years of millennial glory. But the teaching of Scripture appears to us to be very decisive that they will all be raised <u>at once.</u> It is true that in those well-known passages in I. Cor. 15, and I. Thess. 4., we read of the resurrection of <u>believers</u> only, as taking place when "the Lord Himself shall descend with a shout;" the exclusive subject of discourse there being "the resurrection of life." But in the gospel of John (5:25-28-29) we are taught the "shout," or "voice of the Son of God," shall bring back to life "<u>all</u> that are in the graves." It is the same "voice" at the same "hour" which all are to hear. And at the one utterance of that voice "shall all be made alive," though in two classes, and with destinies in prospect fearfully in contrast. In the account of the final judgment in Rev. 20:12-15, the resurrection of <u>all the dead</u>, without distinction, is represented as taking place simultaneously, immediately before the judgment, and in order to it. And in II. Thess. 1:7-10, we have a most explicit announcement of Christ as being revealed from heaven with the two great designs of taking vengeance on the ungodly, and of being glorified in His saints. To us it seems incredible that any one can read this Scripture and yet fancy that the time of His "coming" to be glorified in His saints is to be earlier by a thousand years than the time of His being "revealed" to take vengeance on His enemies.

The only passage which seems to teach that there is to be a first and a second resurrection of the body is Rev. 20:4-6. It should be remembered that this passage forms a part of a prophetical book -- a book that is

constructed on the very principle of a symbol, and highly figurative almost throughout. In fact the whole of the vision where this text lies is symbolical, and to make a transition from the symbolical to the literal, from the obscure and figurative to the direct and simple would be to violate the second rule of interpretation which requires that obscure passages be so explained as to make them agree with those that are plain. It is unreasonable to make the symbolic and figurative language of prophecy or poetry the rule by which to explain the plain and didactic prose language of the Bible. It is no less unreasonable that a multitude of passages should be taken out of their natural sense to make them accord with a single passage of doubtful import. With what bodies will the dead be resurrected? They will be identically to those committed to the grave. All the passages of Scripture which treat of the subject plainly imply, if they do not directly express, the resurrection of the same body. "In my flesh shall I see God" (Job.19:26). "They that are in the graves shall come forth." (John 5:29) "He shall quicken our mortal bodies." (Rom. 8:11). "This corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality," etc. (I. Cor. 15:53-54) "The sea shall give up the dead that are in it," (Rev. 22:13) The very term resurrection implies this identity, that which has been laid down must be taken up; for God to give us a new body, one which the spirit never inhabited, would not be a resurrection, but a creation. The design of the resurrection requires it; the purposes of justice demand that the beings who shall then appear in judgment should be the identical beings who have been here on probation; and that the same body which was the associate of the soul, and the instrument of carrying into effect its good or evil deeds, should partake with it in the joy or the sorrow, the happiness or the misery, of the future state. This identity will be manifest in the saints who are alive at the second coming of our Lord. Their bodies will be changed (I. Cor. 15:51; Phil. 3:21); but that very word proves that they will be composed of the same materials of which they shall consist when the change takes place. And if this shall be the case

with them, is it not reasonable to conclude that so also will it be with the bodies of the dead? The examples which we have had of a resurrection from the dead prove that the same body which dies shall rise again. For, whether we look upon the three examples of the Old Testament, or those of the New, they all rose with the identical bodies possessed before death. "The bodies of the saints" which came out of their graves upon our Saviour's death were certainly the same that had been buried (Matt. 27:52-53). And Christ Himself, when He reappeared to His disciples, declared the body with which He was clothed to be the same body which was crucified (Luke 24:39). And seeing that He "shall change our vile bodies, that they may be fashioned like unto His glorious body" (Phil. 3:21), it follows that we shall rise in the same bodies, and that every particular person at the resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, "Behold, it is I Myself" (Luke 24:39). The transfiguration scene (Matt. 17:2) contains, in miniature, all the elements of the future kingdom of glory in manifestation; the Lord, not in humiliation, but in glory; Moses, glorified, representative of the redeemed who have passed through death into the kingdom (Matt. 13:43); Elijah, glorified, representative of the redeemed who pass into the kingdom without going into the grave (I. Cor. 15:50-53; I. Thess. 4:14-17).

The two great facts of the gospel are Christ's death and Christ's resurrection (I. Cor. 15:3-13-20). These are fundamental, and serve as a key to the gospel. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." (I. John 3:2)

Whatever objections, or difficulties men may suggest relative to the resurrection we can well afford to disregard and take as our hope the plain declarations of God's word.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

There is no doubt that we live under a retributive government, and that cognisance is taken of our actions by an ever present Deity, who loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. And yet, in all ages, there has been a manifest disagreement between the conduct and condition of men. Vice has often appeared to be in the ascendant, while righteousness has been depressed and overwhelmed. The wicked have prospered, having more than heart can wish. The righteous have been the victims of severe and diversified sufferings. This fact is often referred to in the Bible. (Psalm 73:1-13; Eccles. 8:14; Jer. 12:1-4). And there is no way of reconciling these seeming contradictions except by supposing that in another state, vice will receive its due meed of punishment, and righteousness its reward; for, either the idea is erroneous of our living under a moral government at all, or that moral government must have another scene of display, where its impartiality shall be vindicated, and every discrepancy removed. So that it is a truth forced on our attention by what is passing in the world, that men shall be reckoned with in another state for their deeds, and receive distributions of happiness or misery proportioned accurately to the things done on the earth. There is no alternative, if we hold not to the truth of a judgment to come, we must abandon the idea of a moral government. But the Holy Scriptures do not leave us to our own conjectures. They speak plainly and positively and leave no doubt in our minds. (Jude 14,15; Eccles. 12:13-14; Matt. 25:31-46; Acts 17:31,32; Acts 24:25; Rom. 14:12; II.Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:27; Rev. 20:11-15.

For what purpose may we conclude the judgment has been appointed? Not to make God Himself better acquainted with the character of men, but to make both men and angels better acquainted with the character of God. The day of judgment, indeed, is another grand dispensation, when there will be a further display of the glory and character of God. The character of God has already been displayed in creation and redemption, and partly in providence;

but it will then be displayed in the development of His government. In this world the moral government of God is the most obscure of all of His dispensations; but at the day of judgment His moral government will be so openly manifested that the justice, the faithfulness, the holiness, and the goodness of God will be gloriously displayed in the presence of an assembled universe, to the confusion of the wicked and the admiration and joy of the righteous.

Will the one judgment include all the race? By some of the leaders of modern Millennarianism it is supposed that the judgment will be confined to the wicked. But nothing can be more contrary to the plainest teaching of the Bible. Christ said "When the Son of man shall come in all His glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, etc". (Matt. 25:31-46). See also II. Cor. 5:10; II. Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 20:11-12-15) It is impossible to explain these passages and others of like import on any other supposition than that the righteous and the wicked will be judged at the same time at the second coming of Christ.

The Lord Jesus will be the judge. "For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also" (John 5:22-27). See also Acts 10:42; Rom. 14:10; II. Thess. 1:7-10; II. Tim. 4:1. From these passages we learn that it is in His capacity as Mediator that all judgment is committed to the Son. Observe the combined wisdom and mercy in the appointment. He is God and therefore must know all His creatures, all that can be known concerning each one, even every secret thing. He cannot be deceived for He knows every action, every motive, every thought. He is omniscient. But then, He is also "the Son of Man;" He has borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; and therefore will He put Himself in the position of those who are brought to His judgment seat. He will know exactly what they have had to contend with and will be able to

adjust each sentence to the opportunities and capacities of the being on whom it is passed. It is one of the most beautiful and precious of the arrangements of redemption, that the offices of Redeemer and Judge rest in the same person, and that person Divine. It secures towards us tenderness as well as equity; the sympathy of a friend, as well as the disinterestedness of a righteous judge.

In what sense are we to understand the promise that the saints shall judge the world? (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:29-30; I. Cor. 6:2-3.) Bible students are not agreed as to the nature of the promise, or the time of its fulfilment; but it is generally understood to refer to the day of judgment, and to imply that the saints after being judged themselves, shall be assessors with Christ in the judgment wherein He shall condemn all the wicked, as well angels as men.

The circumstances attending the judgment combine every element of greatness, terror, and power. The Judge "shall come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," "and all His holy angels with Him." "The trumpet shall sound," it is the voice of the Judge calling the dead -- calling with a voice that is instantly heard and obeyed. The books will be opened, the book of remembrance and "another book is opened which is the book of life, and the dead will be judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." (Rev. 20:11-15.)

How long a period the judgment will occupy, where it will be held, and how it will be conducted no mortal man can tell. But the results by which it will be followed are clearly revealed. A public and visible separation will be made between the two classes that are gathered before the throne, and the whole will be closed in the solemn, final, and irrevocable settlement of the destinies of all who, from the beginning to the end of time, shall have lived upon the earth. The righteous shall hear the most gracious invitation, "Come ye blessed of my Father, etc." and the wicked shall hear that awful declaration, "Depart ye cursed, etc." (Matt. 25:31-46.)

What are the principles on which the judgment will be conducted?

The unvarying statement is, that men shall be judged "according to their works" (Rev. 20:12; Rev. 22:12). If men have believed in Christ -- and this is the only appointed method of salvation -- the sincerity of their faith will be proved by their works: for "faith worketh by love," and love will prompt to all those acts of holy obedience enjoined in God's word. And if they have not believed with the heart unto righteousness, their want of faith will be evidenced by their works of disobedience to the great law of their being. "Their works" will, therefore, constitute the great subject of inquest; and the formula of final sentence will run thus: "Inasmuch as ye did it; and inasmuch as ye did it not." But, in guiding the decision of the last day by "works" alone, the judgment will be so conducted as to produce in every mind a full conviction of the consumate rectitude of the Divine government (Gen. 18:25; Acts 17:31). Every man shall be dealt with according to this rule "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." (Luke 12:48). The christian shall have his standard of trial, and heathen his (Rom. 2:12-16). That sentence "He that believeth not shall be damned," is spoken of those to whom the gospel is preached. Others it does not concern; and we are not required to determine anything touching their final state. How it will please God, the Judge of all, to deal with them, we may leave to God Himself. But this we know, that He is not the God of the christians only, but the God of the heathen also; that He is rich in mercy to all that call upon Him according to the light they have; and that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him. Among all those who have been privileged with the gospel, exact reckoning will be made of the talents of each, and the opportunities and privileges of each (Matt. 25:14-30); and the measure of punishment accurately adjusted to every measure of guilt (Luke 12:47-48; Matt. 11:20-24). Actions will be estimated by their motives and their intrinsic worth -- not by their appearance or pomp; and the cup of cold water, the prison visit, and the pious wish shall not lose their reward (Matt. 10:42; Matt. 25:35-36).

CHAPTER ~~XXI~~ XXIV

THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

1. The common doctrine is, that the conscious existence of the soul after death of the body is unending; that there is no repentance or reformation in the future world; that those who depart this life unreconciled to God, remain forever in this state of alienation, and are, therefore, forever sinful and miserable. This is the doctrine of the whole Christian church, of the Greeks, Latins, and of all the great historical Protestant churches. It is obvious that this is a question which can be decided only by divine revelation. No one can reasonably presume to decide how long the wicked are to suffer for their sins upon any general principles of right and wrong. The conditions of the problem are not within our grasp. What the infinitely wise and good God may see proper to do with His creatures; or what the exegencies of a government embracing the whole universe and continuing throughout eternal ages, may demand, it is not for such worms of the dust as we are to determine. If we believe the Bible to be the Word of God, all we have to do is to ascertain what it teaches on this subject, and humbly submit.

The terms employed in the Bible to describe the punishment of the ungodly can signify nothing short of proper eternity. The Greek word aionios (αἰώνιος) strictly signifies "eternal", "ever existent", and, throughout the New Testament, is applied indiscriminately to the duration of future woe as well as of future blessedness. Thus we have "everlasting fire" (Matt. 18:8; Matt. 25:41); "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46); "everlasting destruction" (II. Thess. 1:9); "eternal damnation" (sin) (Mark 3:29); "eternal fire" (Jude 7); "everlasting life" (Matt. 19:29); "eternal life" (Luke 10:25); "everlasting habitations" (Luke 16:9); and in many other instances the words eternal and everlasting are used to express endless duration. Now, surely, it is natural and fair to understand these terms, in each occurrence of them, as having the same extent of meaning; and far more fair to take them as

morning strict and proper eternity when [illegible] to begin, and in [illegible] only an indefinite period of time when [illegible] to [illegible]. Besides, in one passage (Matt. 25:46), there is an evident and pointed antithesis between life and punishment, and of both it is affirmed that they are [illegible], the same Greek word being used in both cases. Could not this one passage be enough to decide the point? Who that heard the "faithful witness" use one word on both sides of the alternative could hesitate about his meaning by it the same thing?

2. It is an almost invincible presumption that the Bible does teach the unending punishment of the finally impenitent, that all christians of every denomination, with few exceptions, have so understood it. It is unreasonable to account for the general reception of the doctrine in question on the ground of church authority. It was universally received before the Romish church arrogated to itself the right to dictate to the people of God what they must believe and it continued to be received when, at the Reformation, the authority of the Roman Pontiff was repudiated, and the Scriptures were declared to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Any man, therefore, assumes a fearful responsibility who sets himself in opposition to the faith universal.

3. It is admitted that the doctrine of the eternity of the future punishment of the wicked was held by the Jews under the old dispensation, and at the time of Christ. Neither our Lord nor his apostles ever contradicted that doctrine. They reproved the false teachers of their day for doctrinal errors on many points, but they never insinuated that there was error on this point. They were in nothing inconsistent with it, but confirmed it in the most emphatic manner (Matt. 25:46).

<u>The Principal Views held in Opposition to the Scriptural Doctrine of Eternal Punishment.</u>

1. <u>The Annihilation Theory.</u> [illegible] advocates of this theory are [illegible]. It is [illegible] that immortality was not one of the original attributes of human nature, but is con-

cured to us by the atonement of Christ. All, therefore, who fail to accept the blessings of that atonement finally perish in annihilation. And to support this view, the Scripture terms "to perish," "to die," "to be destroyed," when applied to the future state of the wicked, are interpreted as meaning the total extinction of being. It may suffice to reply, that if there are some passages in which words are used, which, taken by themselves are capable of such a meaning, there are many others in which both the future existence and the eternal punishment of the wicked are most plainly declared. And while the death, loss, destruction, and perishing of the soul are quite susceptible of a meaning in harmony with eternal existence and suffering, the latter cannot possibly be made to bear a meaning in harmony with the future annihilation of being. Let any one carefully note the Scriptures have already been adduced in the course of this chapter, and he will find this statement abundantly verified.

2. The Restoration Theory, the substance of which is, that "bad men, after enduring punishment in various degrees, according to their respective measures of evil desert, and being corrected and reformed by the punishment, shall all finally be delivered, and brought to the possession of happiness." This view was advocated by Origen in the third century, and is now held by Socinians, Unitarians, and Universalists, while it is almost universally opposed by those who hold the Divinity of Christ and the atonement of His death - a circumstance which awakens the suspicion that, in some way, it springs from the same inadequate estimate of the evil of sin and of the justice of God, as does the denial of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.

(1) The texts which are alleged to assert the future restoration of all rational creatures to holiness and happiness are these:- Rom. 5:20-21, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," a beautiful passage, showing that the grace of the gospel was designed to be as extensive and complete as the guilt and contamination of sin. But this design can be secured only "through righteousness;" that is, as stated in the 17th verse, by those

who "receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness." And who does this prove concerning those who "receive the grace of God in vain," and who have "not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Rom. 8:21, - "The creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." This is the "hope" of "the creature." And it should undoubtedly be connected with the preceding verses, thus: "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God (for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same) in hope that (hoti) the creature itself also shall be delivered," etc. How vain and strained must be the interpretation put on these words to represent the lost as living and "waiting" "in hope" and "earnest expectation" of deliverance, when a voice from heaven announces, "between us and you there is a great gulf fixed," etc. (Luke 16:26) The passage does not and cannot refer to the lost, otherwise there can be no truth in this other Scripture, "They shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them" (John 3:36).

I. Cor. 15:22, - "For as in Adam all die, even so also in Christ shall all be made alive." It is strange that such a passage can be forced into this contention, when the most casual glance at the context shows that the exclusive reference is to the resurrection at the last day, when "all shall be made alive" "some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2).

I. Tim. 4:10, - "Who is the Saviour of all men, especially those that believe." How can He be "the Saviour of all men" they ask, unless He delivers all from the torments of hell? In a very important sense He is "the Saviour of all men." He has provided salvation for all, and He has actually saved all men from that "judgment which came upon all men" through "the offence" of Adam; so that none are finally lost as the result of Adam's sin. But He is the Saviour specially of those that believe; that is, who have reached moral accountability, and have [illegible]

cured [illegible] by the [illegible] of Christ. [illegible], therefore, who fail to accept the blessings of that atonement finally perish in annihilation. [illegible] support this view, the Scriptures terms [illegible], "[illegible]," "[illegible]," "[illegible]," when applied to the [illegible] state of the wicked, are [illegible] meaning the total extinction of being. It may suffice to reply, that if there are some passages in which words are used, which, taken by themselves are capable of such a meaning, there are many others in which both the future existence and the eternal punishment of the wicked are most plainly declared. And while the death, loss, destruction, and perishing of the soul are quite susceptible of a meaning in harmony with eternal existence and suffering, the latter cannot possibly be made to bear a meaning in harmony with the future annihilation of being. Let any one carefully note the Scriptures have already been adduced in the course of this chapter, and he will find this statement abundantly verified.

2. The Restoration Theory, the substance of which is, that "bad men, after enduring punishment in various degrees, according to their respective measures of evil desert, and being corrected and reformed by the punishment, shall all finally be delivered, and brought to the possession of happiness." This view was advocated by Origen in the third century, and is now held by Socinians, Unitarians, and Universalists, while it is almost universally opposed by those who hold the Divinity of Christ and the atonement of His death - a circumstance which awakens the suspicion that, in some way, it springs from the same inadequate estimate of the evil of sin and of the justice of God, as does the denial of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.

(1) The texts which are alleged to assert the future restoration of all rational creatures to holiness and happiness are these:- Rom. 5:20-21, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," a beautiful passage, showing that the grace of the gospel was designed to be as extensive and complete as the guilt and contamination of sin. But this design can be secured only "through righteousness;" that is, as stated in the 17th verse, by those

that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," [illegible] not shall be damned (condemned). I. Tim. 2:4, - "who will have all [illegible]" (θέλει) The meaning of the Greek word [illegible] is the [illegible] will, [illegible] tion of all. It is the same glorious truth that is announced in Ezek. 33:11; II. Pet. 3:9; but there is nothing here to [illegible] that those who "will not come to him that they might have life" [illegible] the "everlasting punishment" to which the great Judge will doom them.

These are the principal passages that have been adduced in support of the restoration theory. And one is amazed at the theological trifling which could seek to wrench such a theory out of such Scriptures as these.

(2) It is alleged that the future punishment of the wicked is intended for their correction, and that they will ultimately be subdued by it to allegiance and loyalty, and thus be prepared for the happiness of heaven. Many of the afflictions of this life are the chastisements of [illegible], intended for the amendment of those who are exercised thereby ([illegible] 1[illegible]:[illegible]-11; Prov. 3:11-12); and hence "happy is the man whom God corrected" (Job 5:17; Psa. 94:1[illegible]-15). But we look in vain for a single text to prove that correction is the object of those judicial punishments which are inflicted on the incorrigible sinner; and equally in vain for a text that pronounces the man "happy" upon whom God poureth forth "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" after death. Besides, how inconsistent with the whole system of the gospel to attribute the salvation of man to any other cause than the atonement and mediation of Christ! Those who are reformed by their punitive sufferings would pass into heaven acknowledging no debt of obligation to the precious blood of Christ. It is the purgatorial fire [illegible] which they owe their happy change, and no song would ever escape their lips in a [illegible] attitude to the Lamb that was slain. To such fearful issues are [illegible] overlook the distinction between the [illegible] the judicial punishment of [illegible] Judge.

(3) It is alleged to be inconsistent [illegible]

lence of God to subject His creatures, [illegible], to [illegible] punishment. The answer to this is, that it is just as impossible that God should be a little [illegible] as a great one. If He has permitted such a vast amount of sin and misery to exist in the world, [illegible] the present time, how can we say that it is inconsistent with His goodness, to allow them to continue to exist? How do we know that the reasons, as to speak, which constrained the Almighty to allow His children to be sinful and miserable for thousands of years, may not constrain Him to permit some of them to remain miserable forever? If the highest glory of God and the good of the universe have been promoted by the past sinfulness and misery of man, why may not those objects be promoted by what is declared to be future? It should constrain us to humility and to silence on this subject, when we remember that the most solemn and explicit declarations of the everlasting misery of the wicked recorded in the Scriptures, fell from the lips of Him, who, though equal with God, was found in fashion as a man, and humbled Himself unto death, even the death of the cross, for the salvation of sinful men.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The place of the final abode of the people of God is sometimes called a house; as when the Saviour said: "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2); sometimes "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and Maker is God" (Heb. 11:10). Under this figure it is called the new or heavenly Jerusalem, so gorgeously described in the twenty-first chapter of the book of Revelation. Sometimes it is spoken of as "a better country, that is an heavenly" (Heb. 11:16); a country through which flows the river of the water of life, and "on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and His servants shall serve Him; and they shall see His face, and His name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever." (Rev. 22:2-5). Sometimes the final abode of the righteous is called a "new heavens and a new earth" (II. Pet. 3:13).

As to the blessedness of this heavenly state, we know that it is inconceivable; "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him." (I. Cor. 2:9).

"We know not, O we know not,
What joys await us there;
What radiance of glory,
What bliss beyond compare."

We know, however, that this incomprehensible blessedness of heaven shall arise from the vision of God. This vision is beatific. It beatifies. It transforms the soul into the divine image; transforming into it the divine

life, so that it is filled with the fullness of God. This vision of God is in the face of Jesus Christ, in whom dwells the plenitude of the divine glory bodily. God is seen in fashion as a man; and it is this manifestation of God in the person of Christ that is inconceivably and intolerably ravishing. Peter, James, and John became as dead men when they saw His glory, but for a moment, in the holy mount. The blessedness of the redeemed will arise not only from the manifestation of the glory, but also from the love of God; that love, mysterious, unchangeable, and infinite, of which redemption is the fruit. Another element of the future happiness of God's people is the infinite enlargement of all their faculties. Another is their intercourse and fellowship with the pure and high intelligences of heaven; with all the redeemed and glorified, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and our loved ones; another will be a consciousness of perfect freedom from all sin, and perfect deliverance from all evil.

642 C2 P 37170
12/06/06 33700

mss.coll.007 2:8

ELON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
0 2927 0366818 9

FOR REFERENCE
Not to be taken
from library